

A
LETTER
TO THE
BISHOP OF ST. DAVID'S,

OCCASIONED BY HIS LORDSHIP'S

Misconceptions and Misrepresentations of a Pamphlet,

ENTITLED ;

“ **REFLECTIONS**

CONCERNING THE

Expediency of a Council

OF

THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND

AND

THE CHURCH OF ROME

BEING HOLDEN, &c.”

BY SAMUEL WIX, A.M. F.R. & A.S.

VICAR OF ST. BARTHOLOMEW THE LESS, LONDON.

And now (my Lord) I have done all that I can do, or can be desired, only I cannot repent me of speaking truth, or doing charity. *Epistle Dedicatory to Lord Hatton, prefixed to Bishop Taylor's Polemical Discourses.*

Seek peace, and ensue it. *Psalms xxxiv. 14.*

Μακάριοι οἱ εἰρηνοποιοί *Matt. v. 9.*

London :

PRINTED FOR F. C. & J. RIVINGTON,

NO. 62, ST. PAUL'S CHURCH-YARD;

AND NO. 3, WATERLOO-PLACE, PALL-MALL.

AND SOLD BY ALL OTHER BOOKSELLERS.

1819.

THE

RIGHTS OF THE

WOMAN

IN THE

WEST

INDIES

AND

THE

THE

THE

THE

THE

THE

THE

THE

THE

THE

THE

Printed by R. Gilbert, St. John's Square, London.

PREFACE.

THE Author of the following pages is under the disagreeable necessity of exposing Misconceptions and Misrepresentations of a Pamphlet, published by him in the month of May, 1818, and since republished.

From whatever quarter those Misrepresentations might have proceeded, the exposure of them would have been attended with pain ; but that pain has been greatly increased, since they have proceeded from a Bishop in the Christian Church. With many conflicts, therefore, between the respect which he feels for a superior, and the justice which is due to himself, he has to defend his character from Misrepresentations, which are, professionally, of a very unpleasant nature, amounting to insinuations of Popery against a Protestant Clergyman.

If any reader, from a veneration of the cha-

racter of the Bishop of St. David's, should feel hurt at the charge of Misrepresentation preferred against his Lordship, the Author would beg to observe that he, too, is very much hurt at making it, and that he did all that was in his power to avert the necessity of the charge.

The Bishop of St. David's, so long back as the month of June, 1818, did the Author the honour to send him a printed Preface, purporting to be a Preface to a letter then intended shortly for publication, entitled "The Grand Schism of the 16th Century, &c. In a letter to the Right Honourable Lord Kenyon." The Bishop was immediately apprized of his Misrepresentations. The Author stated how much he was hurt by them, and respectfully requested that a proper explanation might be offered, whenever the Letter to Lord Kenyon should be published. The Bishop's Reply will be seen in the following Letter.

Another printed Preface, with corrections of some errata, and a few additions, was soon afterwards received from the Bishop; but the same Misrepresentations were repeated.

Can the Author then do otherwise than publish a Statement of the Misrepresentations which have been made of his Pamphlet, that it may be seen whether he is indeed justly chargeable with a

disposition to Popery? Is not the charge of a most serious nature? Ought not any Bishop to pause, and gravely to consider, in charity, in common justice, how injurious such a charge, so preferred, may be to the influence which a Clergyman of the Church of England should be anxious to maintain? The Author will yield to no one in just abhorrence of the errors, of the delusions, and of the superstitions, of the Romish Church; but, in the language of the motto which he took to those “Reflections” which have unhappily incurred the Bishop’s displeasure, he repeats: “*As far as the Church of Rome follows reason and truth, we fear not to be their followers**.” But, in captious denial that any good can come out of Rome, or be connected with her, there are some who have objected to the most excellent prayers because they were found in Romish rituals. On the contrary, the Author does not object to prayers or customs which were primitive, because they are found in Romish books of devotion or instruction †. In the spirit of St. Paul, who be-

* Dr. Nicholls’s Supplement to the Commentary on the Book of Common Prayer.

† The views of our Reformers are thus justly described by Dr. Heylin in his Introduction to the Life of Archbishop Laud.

“ Nothing that was apostolic, or accounted primitive, did fare the worse for being Popish; I mean, for having been made use of in times of Popery, it being none of their designs to create a new Church, but to reform the old. Such

came all things to all men, that he might save some, not to the surrender of truth, which never tarnished the zeal for unity which prevailed in the breast of that holy Apostle, the writer, also, would go as far as he could, consistently with scriptural truth, in beseeching his brethren, of whatever persuasion, by the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that they would all speak the same thing, and that there be no divisions among them ; but that they be perfectly joined together in the same mind, and in the same judgment. 1 Cor. i. 10.

Bishop Hall published a learned treatise, entitled, “ No Peace with Rome, wherein is proved (*as terms now stand*) there can be no Reconciliation of the Reformed Religion with the

superstitions and corruptions as had been contracted in that Church, by long tract of time, being pared away, that which was good and commendable did remain as formerly. It was not their intent to dig up a foundation of such precious-stones, because some superstructures of straw and stubble had been raised upon it.” P. 4. Again, “ They proceeded carefully and vigorously to a reformation. In the managing of which great business, they took the Scripture for their ground, according to the general explication of the ancient fathers ; the practice of the primitive times for their rule and pattern, as it was expressed to them in approved authors. No regard had they to Luther or Calvin, in the procedure of their work, but only to the writings of the Prophets and Apostles, *Christ Jesus* being the *corner-stone* of that excellent structure.” P. 3.

Romish." There can, indeed, be no reconciliation of the reformed religion with the Romish, *as terms now stand*; that is, while the errors and corruptions, unhappily maintained by the Church of Rome, are unrenounced, and while the supremacy of the Pope over all Christian Churches is asserted; yet does the Bishop of St. David's very incautiously so construct his arguments as to insinuate, that Mr. Wix's object was union with the Church of Rome in her unreformed state. "Till the Church of Rome," he writes, "has reformed itself, and ceases to be what it is, there must ever exist insurmountable obstacles to communion between the two Churches*." And "in the attempt to allay domestic schism (which is Mr. Wix's professed object in his *Reflections*) by the union of the Church of England with a foreign schismatical and arbitrary power, there is something so incongruous and unnational, that nothing can exceed its hopelessness, but the means proposed to bring it about †." The truth is, that

* Vide Letter VI. of Philopatris to Dr. Phillimore.

† Ibid. This Letter was sent to Mr. Wix by the Bishop of St. David's, previously to its appearing in the *Morning Post*, in the form of a Preface to the intended Letter to Lord Kenyon, the name of the Bishop of St. David's being printed on the title-page. Mr. Wix is, therefore, warranted in considering the Letters which appeared in the *Morning Post*, at the commencement of this present year, under that signature, as the Letters of the Bishop of St. David's. These Letters have since been printed and published as a pamphlet.

so excessive are the prejudices of the amiable Bishop of St. David's against the Church of Rome, that he cannot separate the proposal as to the expediency of a Council to consider, whether measures may be adopted to prevail with the Romanists to renounce their errors, as the way to Christian union, from a disposition to unite with those errors; and he appears to have lost that regard for the Church of Rome, as a true, or

It is some consolation to the Author to find that the Bishop, in the 8th Letter to Dr. Phillimore, as published in a pamphlet, acquits him of an intention of wishing for union with the Church of Rome, *in her unreformed state*. It was observed in the Address to the Roman Catholics, prefixed to the second edition of the Reflections; "You can make no concessions, you ought to make none, in matters of essential doctrine," that is, not in matters of doctrine deemed by them essential, but in those that are really and scripturally essential. On which, the Bishop observes, "But without the concession of doctrines, *esteemed by them essential*, the Church of Rome will be in an unreformed state. And with the Church of Rome *in an unreformed state*, Mr. Wix disclaims all union." Yet does the Bishop, after this acquittal, and after, in the same Letter, observing that "he does not charge Mr. Wix with proposing an union with the Church of Rome in an unreformed state, but with pre-supposing concessions, on one side, which the Roman Church *will not* make, and on ours which we cannot admit," publish his Letter to Lord Kenyon, to show that "the project of union with *the unreformed Church of Rome*, is inexpedient, impracticable, unprotestant, uncharitable," &c. P. 2, of *Letter to Lord Kenyon*.

as a *real*, (if he prefer that word) though a *corrupted*, branch of the Church of Christ, which the soundest Protestants have not scrupled to allow her. That eminent Bishop, just referred to, Bishop Hall, whom the Bishop of St. David's will not charge with Popery, justly observes :

“ Too many seem unto me to misconceive the state of our Church and the Romish, as if they had been always two ; as if, from their first foundations, they had been sensibly severed in time and place, like to Babylon and Jerusalem.” *Section I.*

Again : “ Neither did that *Valdus* of France, nor *Wickliffe* of England, nor *Hierom* of Prague, nor *Luther* of Germany, ever go about to frame a new Church to themselves, which was not ; but only endeavoured (not without happy success) to cleanse, scour, reform, that Church, which was, from that filthy soil, both of disorder and errors, wherewith it was shamefully blemished. All these rather desired to be accounted physicians to heal, than parents to beget, a Church.” *Ibid.*

Again : “ She (the Roman Church) is a truly visible Church, but an unsound. In what she holds the principles, we embrace her, in what destroys them, we pity her error, and hate her obstinacy.” *Ibid.*

Agreeably to this, a modern writer, himself a convert from Popery, justly observes :

“ The Protestants are still united to that Christian Church, of which they formed a part before the Reformation ; as they still retain those doctrines which formed the substance of that very Church with which, till then, they held communion. They, therefore, never separated from the religion of their fathers ; but only lopping off such excrescences as had disfigured it, they continued in the profession of what the Apostles taught, and the purest ages both believed and practised. So far from introducing any novelties into the Christian scheme, they rejected that alone which was novel and unscriptural. So that, in fact, they are the ancient stock, the Mother Church : whereas, as the Roman Catholics neither adhere to Scripture, nor to the doctrines of the primitive times, and have embraced many new opinions, unknown to antiquity, they were so far from having any exclusive title to that appellation, that they are at best but strayed sheep, *still, indeed, belonging to the fold*, though wandering beyond the reach of the shepherd's call.”

Hawkins's Appeal to Scripture, Reason, and Tradition. In a Letter to William Pelling, P. 189.

The Bishop of St. David's is known to give

his powerful support to the British and Foreign Bible Society, which, not in its object of circulating the Scriptures, as has been most incorrectly asserted, but in its latitudinarian constitution, and sectarian association, is considered by the author, and by many others, to be the grand modern engine of schism and religious insubordination in this kingdom. This view of that Society has been freely stated by the Author, and the Bishop has unfortunately taken offence. The Author cannot retract his opinion : for the longer he lives, the more he has occasion to lament the baneful operation of that mischievous association in confounding error with truth.

The Clergy of the Established Church, who are engaged in the active duties of their profession, know more than the Bishops generally can know how alarmingly sound doctrine is on the decline. It is no wanton impeachment of the discernment of our Bishops, nor will it be deemed, it is hoped, in the slightest degree, disrespectful to them, to state this ; since the comparative difference of knowledge, in this respect, is unavoidable, from the different nature of the duties devolving on the different classes of the sacred profession.

Many among those classes of the Clergy, whose parochial duties lead them to a more intimate

acquaintance with the people, knowing how much, in the midst of profession, the true faith is declining, lament, with the Author, that any of our Bishops should unintentionally advance the great evil of schism and false doctrine, by countenancing a Society which has "taken away," as Bishop Taylor once expressed himself, on another occasion, "all cognizance of schism, by mingling all sects, and giving countenance to that against which all power ought to stand upon their guard."

Bishop Taylor's Address to the Pious and Devout Reader, prefixed to THE GOLDEN GROVE.

No Bishop has more distinctly stated the constitution of the Christian Church, than the Bishop of St. David's has done in his "*First Principles of Christian Knowledge*;" yet, from a goodness which allows him not to suspect evil of others, his Lordship gives countenance to a Society, whose tendency is to neutralize all the exterior forms, as well as all the peculiar doctrines, of Christianity, and grants his great authority to schismatics, some of whom are hostile to the discipline and constitution of the Church, and many of whom are, also, active promoters of the fatal errors of those, who deny the divinity, and who reject the atonement of OUR BLESSED LORD AND SAVIOUR JESUS CHRIST!

Men, alas ! who despise our sacraments, and others who deny the atonement of Jesus Christ, are they with whom the Bishop of St. David's, from the purest motives, religiously associates in this Society.

It is inconceivable to the Author how any Bishop (having vowed that he will, the Lord being his helper, be " ready, with all faithful diligence, to drive away all erroneous and strange doctrine contrary to God's word ; and both privately and openly, call upon and encourage others to the same *,") can countenance, by his presence at the Society, persons hostile to the discipline and the faith of the Christian Church ; how he can support a Society, which derives a portion of its funds from the preaching of a schismatical ministry ; and this, on the popular pretext that there is to be no interference with the peculiar notions or errors of any sect. Is it right, the Author would respectfully submit for consideration, that there should be no interference with them ?

For proposing consideration, as to the expediency of a Council being holden between the Church of England and the Church of Rome, with a view to *the renunciation of error* as the

* Vide the Form of Ordaining or Consecrating of an ARCHBISHOP OR BISHOP.

way to union, the Author is misrepresented and censured : while the Bishop and all Churchmen, who think and act with his Lordship, sanction, by their example, an association with enemies of the Church, and deniers of the prominent Articles of the Christian faith ; an association naturally lessening the horror that should apply to false doctrine. The Author deprecates the prevailing evils of an association, thus formed, and thus promoting religious indifference to sound faith. Trembling for those which may follow, he keeps himself from the association, and would wish others to keep themselves, also, from it. May not, therefore, the quotation made by the Bishop of St. David's be, with much more propriety adopted by the Author and those who think with him on the tendency and effects of an association with schismatics of all existing denominations.

“ Imo potius bona, patriam, parentes, omnia relinquamus, quam ut sic inveniamur
 ἑτεροζυγούμετες ἀπιστοῖς.”

Some who have honoured the Author by reading his “ Reflections,” may be of opinion that he has expressed himself with too much warmth against the British and Foreign Bible Society. He disclaims any feeling that is inconsistent with the generous spirit of Christianity towards the

members who compose that Society, be they Churchmen or Dissenters. Shocked at the decline of attachment to the true faith which he apprehends is the consequence, and must be the increasing consequence, of an association of persons professing truth and error, he has freely expressed his alarm, and censured the unhappy operation of what he considers imprudent communication. But, for many of the members of the Society, as devout and well-meaning men, he entertains the warmest esteem. Nor let him be called illiberal, because he cannot think with pleasure, nor indeed but with most painful regret, of this dangerous association of discordant professors. On this subject, he begs to repeat what he observed in a note at p. 87, of his "Reflections."

"It is not unusual with the members of the Bible Society, uncandidly to misrepresent those who refuse to join the Society, as enemies of the Bible, and impeters of its circulation. The same persons take pleasure in boasting with invidious comparison of others who act not with them, that *they* will unite with those of every creed and of no creed, in the endeavour to do good. Let them, first, however, ascertain that their endeavours tend to do good. An association that has in view the bodily relief and the kind protection of our fellow-creatures, with whatever persons, is commendable; but we are under a prior obliga-

tion, in regard to religious association, to be most careful to avoid communication with all deniers of Christian truth, since that communication tends to a compromise of sound doctrine, and is inconsistent with that honest zeal with which we are to contend for the faith. Here, as it appears to the writer, is the commanding and unanswerable argument against that indiscriminate association of Churchmen with Dissenters, invited by the Bible Society."

In another part of his "Reflections," alluding to the mischief resulting, as he conceived, to the faith of the Gospel, from the imprudent association of truth and error, the Author observed ;

" Many most judicious and most pious Christians, have, consequently, been deterred from attaching themselves to the Society, who have, therefore, as uncharitably, as falsely, been represented to be unfriendly to the circulation of the Scriptures. But this is a calumny, unworthy of the cause of truth, which the members of the Society would affect to have at heart. They know better. They *know* that the objection to joining the Society is not founded on any disinclination to circulate the Scriptures, but arises from a pious fear, which should influence *them* also, lest injury should accrue to the true faith, from their being circulated by a body indiscriminately formed of

Churchmen and the various Dissenters. They know, but the Public may not know, and therefore should be informed, that very many, who are cruelly calumniated by the zealous partizans of the British and Foreign Bible Society, as being *unfriendly to the distribution of the Scriptures*, were associated with another Society, in actively circulating them, many years before the British and Foreign Bible Society existed. *Their* objection, consequently, it may be repeated, is not against circulating the Scriptures ; but it is against circulating them in a way, which they once apprehended *might* be, but which now, alas ! they observe to have actually been, hostile to the faith of Christ, and destructive of the harmony of the Church. Let the uncandid insinuation, then, be no more made, that the enemies of the Bible Society, or rather the enemies of the mischiefs which it is operating, are the enemies of the Bible's circulation." P. 89 of *Reflections*.

TO
THE RIGHT REVEREND
THE
LORD BISHOP OF ST. DAVID'S.

MY LORD,

London, Nov. 1, 1819.

YOUR Lordship has lately addressed a Letter to the Right Honourable Lord Kenyon, entitled

“ English Reformation and Papal Schism ; or the Grand Schism of the Sixteenth Century, in this Country, shewn to have been the Separation of the Roman Catholics from the Church of England and Ireland ; in a Letter to the Right Honourable Lord Kenyon, on Mr. Wix's Plan of Union between the Churches of England and of Rome.”

I feel it due to my character, as a Clergyman of the Church of England, to request the attention of your Lordship, and that of the Public, to certain passages of that Letter, and of the Preface to it, as they apply to a Pamphlet published by me, entitled ; “ Reflections concerning the Expediency of a Council of the Church of England and the Church of Rome being holden, with a View to accommodate Religious Differences, and to promote the Unity of Religion in the Bond of Peace.”

Your Lordship commences the Preface to your Letter by stating the objects of the correspondence between the Doctors of the Sorbonne, and Archbishop Wake, and you observe that,

“ The origin and object of the correspondence which passed between the Archbishop and the Doctors of the Sorbonne on this occasion, were misconceived and misrepresented by MOSHEIM and the Author of the *CONFESSIONAL* ; and that their misconceptions and misrepresentations, though refuted by the learned Translator of Mosheim, have, unhappily, been propagated to this day ; as is evident from a lately proposed *Union of the Church of England with the Church of Rome.*” Preface, P. 11.

By this “ *lately proposed Union of the Church of England with the Church of Rome,*” your Lordship evidently alludes to my “ *Reflections concerning the Expediency of a Council of the Church of England and the Church of Rome.*”

As I proceed, I beg to observe, that the statement of “ *a lately proposed Union of the Church of England with the Church of Rome,*” does not accurately mark the object, nor convey the tendency of those “ *Reflections ;*” since it implies that Union with the Church of Rome was their primary object *, whereas

* In the 8th Letter of Philopatres to Dr. Phillimore, the Bishop of St. David's, replying to Mr. Wix's statement that Union between the Churches of England and Rome was not his *primary object*, observes ; “ If Union with the Church of Rome was intended, it is of no consequence whether it was a primary or a secondary object.”

Some of the soundest Protestants have felt that, when the Roman Church shall abandon her spiritual corruptions, she may be received as of the family of Christ.

their object was, earnestly to solicit attention whether the effect of the Council proposed might not prove highly advantageous to the Christian cause, by leading to the renunciation of error, and the promotion of Christian unity. The difference is, indeed, great; so great, that, as your Lordship states my object, a conclusion may be made that I was desirous of Union with the Roman Church in her *unreformed* state.

I respectfully intreat attention to the title of my work; "Reflections concerning the Expediency of a Council of the Church of England and the Church of Rome being holden, with a View to accommodate Re-

Bishop Hall, in his Treatise entitled; "No Peace with the Church of Rome, wherein is proved (*as terms now stand*) there can be no reconciliation of the reformed religion with the Romish," observes;

"We will gladly speak unto them, and (if need be) upon our knees in Cyprian's words *: Sithence we may not come forth of the sound and true Church of God, and come unto you; let us beseech and intreat yon, by whatsoever should be most dear unto you, that you would return to our fraternitie, and into the bosom of that Mother Church whence ye are revolted; and as he said in *Theocritus*, yet at last be persuaded; we are both brothers of one blood, why will ye needs fight more against yourselves, than your brethren." *Section 22.*

Bishop Hall was unfriendly to a General Council being called in his day; fearing it might be ineffectual, yet he said, "Certainly if there be any spark of good hope yet alive, it must be in the aid and determination of a General Council." *Section 22.* If any other mode less liable to objection, and equally, or more efficacious, could be devised, to purify corruption and error, and to advance Christian Union, the Author would most willingly prefer that mode.

ligious Differences, and to promote the Unity of Religion in the Bond of Peace:" not Reflections suggesting an unqualified Union with the Church of Rome, not Reflections recommending the compromise of truth, or the perpetuation of error; but Reflections concerning the Expediency of a Council to be holden, as is abundantly illustrated throughout the Pamphlet, to consider whether measures might be happily devised to forward the renunciation of error, to promote glory to God on high, and to secure on earth, peace, good will towards men!

Now, in the passage which I have quoted from your Lordship's Preface, I am charged with propagating to this day, though they have been refuted by the learned Translator of Mosheim, the *Misconceptions and Misrepresentations* of MOSHEIM, and the Author of the CONFSSIONAL. And what are the Misconceptions and Misrepresentations of MOSHEIM and of the Author of the CONFSSIONAL? The Misconception or "incorrect Report" of Mosheim, as it is quoted in the singular by your Lordship at p. 13 of your Preface, is, that "the Archbishop [Wake] formed a project of peace and union between the English and Gallican Churches, founded upon this condition, that each of the two Communities should retain the greatest part of their respective and peculiar doctrines *," and the Misrepresentations of the Author of the Confessional, as they are also quoted at p. 13 and 14 of your Preface, are in describing the Archbishop as "entering into a correspondence with certain Doctors of the Sorbonne, in order to support an Union [of the Church

of England] with their *Popish* Church, on the foot of mutual concessions*," and in stating that the Archbishop "*had set on foot a project for Union with a Popish Church, and that with concessions in favour of the grossest superstition and idolatry†.*" With propagating this Misconception of Mosheim, and these Misrepresentations of the Author of the Confessional, I, a Clergyman of the Church of England, am charged by a Bishop of my own Church! I appeal from the charge to the candour of your Lordship.

At the commencement of the Preface to my Pamphlet, I quoted the words of the Archbishop in his Letter to Mr. Beauvoir, relative to a project of Union, as I then stated, between the *English* and *Gallican* Churches; not as your Lordship incorrectly insinuates between *the Church of England and the Church of Rome.*

I beg attention to my note at p. 6 of my Preface to the first edition, or at p. 36 to the second edition, with the words of the Archbishop's Letter as I there quoted them. The whole Note is as follows.

" In a Letter from Archbishop Wake, dated August 30, 1718, relative to a project of Union between the English and Gallican Churches, and addressed to the Rev. Mr. Beauvoir, Chaplain to the Earl of Stair, then Ambassador at Paris, the Archbishop, referring to the advances made on that occasion, by Dr. Du Pin, one of the Doctors of the Sorbonne, writes thus:—

" ' I cannot tell what to say to Dr. Du Pin. - If he thinks we are to take their direction what to retain,

* Confessional, Preface to the 2d. Ed. P. 76.

† See the Confessional, 2d. Ed. Pref. P. 76.

and what to give up, he is utterly mistaken. I am a friend to peace, but more to truth : and they may depend upon it, I shall always account our Church to stand upon an equal foot with theirs ; and that we are no more to receive laws from them, than we desire to impose any upon them. In short, the Church of England is free, is orthodox ; she has a plenary authority within herself, and has no need to recur to any other Church to direct her what to retain, or what to do. Nor will we, otherwise than in a brotherly way, and in a full equality of right and power, ever consent to have any treaty with that of France. And, therefore, if they mean to deal with us, they must lay this down for the foundation, that we are to deal with one another upon equal terms. If, consistently with our own Establishment, we can agree upon a closer Union with one another, well : if not, we are as much, and upon as good grounds, a free and independent Church as they are.' ”

I added,

“ The principle of the Archbishop's Letter, is the principle which should guide any Council between the Church of England and the Church of Rome.”

This principle of the Archbishop, namely, that “ he would always account our Church to stand upon an equal foot with their's,” [the GALLICAN CHURCH] “ that we are no more to receive laws from them than we desire to impose any upon them. In short, that the Church of England is free, is orthodox ; that she has a plenary authority within herself,” &c. I stated to be the principle which should guide any Council between the Church of England and the Church of Rome ; for which application of the Archbishop's principle to any Council that should be called between

the Church of England and the Church of Rome, although I used the very words of the Archbishop, and stated how *he* applied them to the *Gallican* Church, I am charged with misconceiving and misrepresenting his Grace's object. I wrote to your Lordship, who favoured me by sending me your Preface before it was published, expressing my regret that I should be so misunderstood, and requesting that you would be pleased to offer to the Public a proper explanation, to which your Lordship, in a Letter dated "Aberguilly Palace, July 4, 1818," replied,

"Mr. Wix thinks his proposal is on the same principle with Archbishop Wake's. The Bishop of St. David's Preface shows that Archbishop Wake's object was Union with the *Gallican* Church, not with *the Church of Rome* *."

Was it not expressly stated by me, in my Preface, that the Archbishop's correspondence was relative to a project of Union between the *English* and *Gallican* Churches? Is there not, at p. 95 of my Pamphlet, the following Note?

"A correspondence was, about the year 1717 and 18, entered into between the Doctors of the Sorbonne at Paris, and Dr. Wake, Archbishop of Canterbury, with a view to accommodation between the *Gallican* and Protestant Churches of England."

Your Lordship and the Public are now able to judge, and will judge, with impartiality, whether I have misconceived Archbishop Wake's correspondence with the Doctors of the Sorbonne, and whether I have

* In the same Letter, the Bishop observes, "Mr. Wix's Proposal for Union with *the Church of Rome* is favourable to Popery."

continued, as I am charged with having done, to propagate the Misconceptions of Mosheim; or the Misrepresentations of the Author of the Confessional, as to the Archbishop's having set on foot *a project for Union with a Popish Church, and that with concessions in favour of the grossest superstition and idolatry!*

Having quoted a passage from the Ecclesiastical History of Dr. Jortin, which justly demonstrates the "*utter impossibility*" of Protestants being reconciled to the various errors of the Church of Rome, which errors are specified in the passage, such as "*the infallibility of the Popes, or Councils, the Celebration of the Eucharist in one kind, Transubstantiation, Celibacy* imposed upon the Monks, the Nuns, and the Clergy, the Worship of *Images*, and Relics, the Usefulness of *Monasteries*, the *Miracles* ascribed to Impostors, Fanatics, and Lunatics, and a multitude of other things so *contrary to religion*, and to *common sense* *," your Lordship observes;

"Yet this utter impossibility of Re-Union between us and the Papists is overlooked in the recent proposal for holding 'a Council of the Church of England and the Church of Rome.' To such *Re-Union* insurmountable obstacles exist in the *unreformed* state of the Roman Church." *P. 21 of the Bishop's Preface.*

Were the "*Reflections concerning the Expediency of a Council of the Church of England and the Church of Rome being holden,*" offered with a view to *Re-Union* with the Church of Rome in her *unreformed*

* Jortin's Eccles. Hist. Vol. III. P. 208 Edit. 1805.

state? Or, could the Author of the "Reflections" be fairly represented as having wholly overlooked an "utter impossibility" of Re-Union, *while the errors mentioned by Dr. Jortin were retained*? Let the following extracts from those Reflections be candidly perused.

EXTRACTS FROM MR. WIX'S REFLECTIONS.

"It is well known how unpopular any proposal towards an Union between Protestants and Roman Catholics will be. In apology, let it be known that the proposal is made, expressly and solely, on the ground that the Council to be called be holden in a spirit of candid concession; in an humble disposition *to renounce whatever opinions or practices, after sincere prayer to the Almighty, and charitable consultation, shall appear erroneous.*" "Preface, P. 6 of 1st Edition." P. 35 of 2d Edition.

"It is thought that the Church of England, she being the great reformed Church in Apostolical succession, should propose to the Church of Rome, a meeting, to consider, with all possible affection and forbearance, whether some plan might not be devised to accommodate their religious differences. The Church of Rome might, perhaps, relax in what the Church of England considers her *fundamental errors.*" P. 12 of *the Reflections.*

"No solid objection prevails against the Church of England attempting an Union with the Church of Rome; since the Church of Rome is acknowledged by the Church of England to be a true Apostolical Church. She denies no article of faith which the

Church of England maintains to be requisite to salvation; though she entertains, in addition, opinions which the Church of England considers unnecessary or erroneous; many of which the Romish Church, on kind consultation, might be disposed to renounce." *P. 29 of the Reflections.*

"In the spirit of the Gospel, it is, indeed, most fervently to be desired, that, *on the renunciation of error*, the Episcopal Church all over the world might appear as one fold under one shepherd, Jesus Christ*." *Ibid. P. 79.*

* The very amiable Doctor Horne, Bishop of Norwich, in his beautiful sermon on Christian Unity, thus writes:—

"If we consider the Church as being espoused to the Lamb, she thereby becomes endowed with his excellencies, she takes his name, and shares his unspeakable dignity, his everlasting love, and Almighty protection. These are the happy effects of the union between Christ and the Church.

"One more consequence should follow from it, and would to God it were every where visible, viz. an Union among Christians. Joined to one common Head, they should be joined likewise to each other, 'keeping the Unity of the Spirit, in the bond of peace,' &c. By concord in the Church, the kingdom of Christ is established on earth, as it is in heaven, where there is no rebellion, or opposition to the will of God, but all are unanimous in doing it. By the Gospel enmity was abolished, and never should have been heard of more. All nations, however different before in rites, ceremonies, languages and tempers, were called to the same grace, incorporated into one city of peace, and made to communicate with each other in holy offices, in prayers, and in sacraments, in devotion and charity, living together in the house of their heavenly Father, and eating of one bread at his table. 'There is one body and one spirit, even as ye are called in one hope of your calling; one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in you all.'

"There was a time, and it is pleasing to look back to it, when

“ Let then the Clergy of the Church at least, prove, in the midst of much lukewarmness, that *they* see and feel the necessity of maintaining inviolate one visible Catholic Church. As they admit the ordination and authority of the Roman Episcopacy, they must also admit, that the Union proposed, *provided that error shall be abandoned*, may be made.” *Ibid.* P. 92.

“ Whatever may be the errors of the Church of Rome, they are not, in the view of the Writer, so alarming, nor should they be, in the view of any sound Member of the Church of England, as the errors of the Socinians, the Anabaptists, the Quakers, and others, who reject Episcopal Discipline, and depart widely from Apostolical Faith. For the Church of Rome has the foundation of true faith, and the advantages of a discipline modelled after apostolical practice. A Conference, therefore, with her, now that the heat of the Reformation has in a great degree subsided, might, under Almighty blessing, given to fervent prayer, be the happy means of leading to the *renunciation of error*, and of bringing about a Chris-

a Christian, furnished with proper credentials from his Bishop might travel through the world, from east to west, and from north to south, and be received to communion with his brethren in any part of the globe then known. There will be a time, and it is comfortable to look forward to it, when Infidelity, Heresy, and Schism shall come to an end, and there shall be no contention among the redeemed, but in giving glory, and honour, and thanks to him that sitteth on the throne. In the mean season, as they will stand fairest for Heaven, who live in concord upon earth, let us consider how we may best perform this part of our duty.”

Bishop Horne's Sermon on Christian Unity, 2 Cor. xiii. 11.

tian Union, which might restrain the alarming progress of that unscriptural variety of opinion which prevails, to the great injury of our common religion. *Ibid.* P. 94.

“The attention of the public is therefore called to the increase of sectarianism, and to the increase of the Roman Catholics; and consideration is earnestly solicited whether the effect of the Council proposed might not prove highly advantageous to the Christian cause, by leading to the renunciation of error, and the Promotion of Christian Unity.” *Postscript*, P. 100.

“He [the Author] therefore repeats how much it becomes every member of Christ to endeavour, *by all legitimate means*, to promote the reunion of Christians, and how commanding the duty is, that all, according to their several abilities, should strive that the Roman Catholics, wheresoever dispersed, *as they manifest a disposition to reform from error*, may not become preys to the sectarianism and indifference now so generally, so unhappily, prevailing.” *Appendix*, P. 108. *Second Edition*.

A perusal of the preceding extracts from my pamphlet must, I apprehend, exonerate me from the imputation of having desired an Union with the Church of Rome in her *unreformed* state. My object was, that a Council should be called, with a view to the *renunciation of error*, as *the means* of a consequent Union of Churches. Your Lordship will not contend that if error should be renounced, and corruptions reformed, there would necessarily exist an utter impossibility of Union. Nor will it be denied, that, in proportion as our fellow creatures are in error so ought our exertions to be increased to remove their error. Dr. Du Pin, in one of his letters to Archbishop Wake,

respecting the desired Union between the *English* and *Gallican* Churches, thus writes; (and may not his words be adopted in reference to the Roman Catholics generally?)

“Unum addam cum bonâ Veniâ tuâ, me vehementer optare, ut Unionis inter Ecclesias Anglicanam et Gallicanam ineundæ via aliqua inveniri posset: non ita sumus ab invicem in plerisque dissiti, ut non possimus mutuo reconciliari. Atque utinam Christiani omnes essent unum ovile.”

Appendix III. to Mosheim's Ecclesiastical History, translated by Archibald Maclaine, D. D. Vol. VI. P. 70.*

I may have indiscreetly judged, when I proposed for Consideration the Expediency of a Council between the Church of England and the Church of Rome, as being likely to promote the Renunciation of Error, on which ground I have alone hoped for Union. Your Lordship, in your high office in the Church, had a peculiar right to show my mistake, if you considered me mistaken, and I should have respectfully attended to any remarks with which you had been pleased to honour my proposal; but you should not have misrepresented me, nor charged me with misrepresentations of which I am not guilty. I am grieved to be under the necessity of writing thus to a much respected superior in the Christian Priesthood; but I am bound to repel misre-

* In English:—“I will add one more observation, with your permission; that I anxiously desire that some means of Union could be discovered between the English and Gallican Churches. We are not so far removed from each other, but we might be mutually reconciled. And I wish that all Christians were of one fold.”

presentations; since I have a cause to support;—the cause of my Saviour, who calls upon me, as his Minister, to strive with my full might, “that all may be one; *that the world may believe that God hath sent him**,” and I have a sacred character to support; but, if I be represented as desirous of Union with the Church of Rome in her *unreformed* state, as wishing to compromise truth, and as having misstated writers, in vain I shall hope to discharge those important duties of instruction which devolve on me, in virtue of the commission which I have received, to teach and to exhort in the Church of Christ.

It may be retorted upon me, that I am charging a Bishop with misrepresentation; but it will be remembered that I am on my defence, and that the charges against me ought to be refuted.

Again, your Lordship, having offered extracts from Bishop Taylor’s *Dissuasive from Popery*, demonstrative of that Bishop’s disapprobation of certain doctrines and practices of the Church of Rome, observes:—

“Such is the decided, and defended judgment of ‘that great, that good, that pious Protestant Bishop,’ whom Mr. Wix has represented as *favourable to Popery*.” *Preface. P. 23.*

Most respectfully, but most decidedly, I must contradict the charge. I never did represent Bishop Taylor as favourable to popery. —Such a conclusion is unwarranted by my language, at p. 31 of my pamphlet, referred to by your Lordship.

I wish that your Lordship had quoted the whole pas-

* John xvii. 21.

sage to which you refer, instead of giving only the first two or three lines of it, and commencing them with a misquotation. I must, therefore, quote the passage from my pamphlet, as it there occurs.

At p. 31 *, having lamented the multiplication of sects, and that, instead of there appearing to be *one faith* and *one baptism*, we should find as many faiths as there are discordant opinions. I observed :

“ This want of Union, in matters of religion, has long been very seriously lamented, by the Writer of these cursory Reflections. He has never adverted to the sad subject without most earnestly wishing that something, under the blessing of God, might be done to reconcile, on genuine Christian principles, the contending professors of Christ’s religion. And, after much consideration, and humble prayer to Almighty God, it appears to him that no means are more likely to conduce to this very desirable end, than that the great reformed Church of England should, by dispassionate consultation with the Church of Rome, and by reference to earliest opinions and practices, establish some form of sound words, which might, under God and the Scriptures, concentrate their belief; and that, united as one fold, under one Shepherd, Jesus Christ, they might become together the rallying point of sound faith, and the focus of religious education to the whole world. Let none suppose that the Writer is insensible of the errors or improprieties of the Church of Rome; among which may be reckoned, in addition to those already mentioned, the impropriety of the Church Service being in a language not understood by the common people. He knows the errors and improprie-

* P. 30, first Edition.

ties of that Church, and he laments them; but he knows too, with the great Jeremy Taylor, that ‘ If we consider the doctrines themselves’ [of the Roman Catholics] ‘ we shall find them to be superstructures ill-built, and worse managed ; but yet they keep the foundation ; they build upon God in Jesus Christ ; they profess the apostles’ creed ; they retain faith and repentance as the supporters of all our hopes in heaven ; and believe many more truths than can be proved to be of simple and original necessity to salvation, whilst their errors are not faults of their will, but weaknesses and deceptions of the understanding ; so that there is nothing in the *foundation of faith* that can reasonably hinder them to be permitted. The foundation of faith stands secure enough for all their vain and unhandsome superstructures.’ *Liberty of Propheying*, Sect. 20.

“ *Feeling* with this great, this good, this pious Protestant Bishop, the Writer cannot agree with those, who, in intemperate zeal, have, as uncharitably, as absurdly, stated the Church of Rome to be the Antichristian Power.”

In no other passage of my Pamphlet (except at Page 100*, where, in the Postscript, this passage of Bishop Taylor is referred to as illustrative of the Roman Catholic Faith, comprising the genuine doctrines of the Gospel) is there an allusion to Bishop Taylor. And, because I professed a *feeling* with “ that great, that good, that pious Protestant Bishop, that the Roman Catholics, ‘ keep the foundation, build upon God in Jesus Christ, profess the apostles’ creed’,” &c. and because I asserted that, so feeling, I could not agree that the Church of Rome was *the Antichristian Power*,

I am described as having represented Bishop Taylor *favourable to popery!* I am desirous that I may not be thought to have taken such an unwarrantable liberty with that Bishop, as so to have represented him; I am anxious that I may not be thought to have been so inattentive a reader of his works as to have offered such a conclusion.

I must, however, repeat how much I wish that your Lordship had quoted the whole passage as it occurs in my "Reflections," from which you draw your inference.

The whole of the quotation which your Lordship gives from my Reflections, is in a note as follows:

"*Thinking* with this great, this good, this pious, Protestant Bishop, the Writer cannot agree with those who in an intemperate zeal," &c. (*Reflections concerning the Expediency of a Council*, &c. P. 31.)

Now, by referring to Page 32 of those "Reflections*," the passage will be seen not to begin with, "*Thinking* with this great, this good, this pious, Protestant Bishop," &c. but, "*Feeling* with this great, this good, this pious, Protestant Bishop," &c. and this *feeling* plainly referred to that good Bishop's charitable acknowledgment, quoted by me in the preceding lines, that the Roman Catholics "keep the foundation, build upon God in Jesus Christ; profess the apostles' creed; retain faith and repentance as the supporters of all our hopes in heaven," &c. "*Feeling*," I immediately subjoined, "with this good, this great, this pious Protestant Bishop," as to his acknowledgment of the *fundamentals of faith being professed by the Roman Catholics*, "the writer cannot agree with those who, in an intemperate zeal, have, as uncharitably as ab-

* Page 31, in 1st Edit.

surdly, stated the Church of Rome to be the Anti-christian Power." It is for this acknowledgment, that I did not agree with those who considered the Church of Rome to be THE ANTICHRISTIAN POWER; an acknowledgment sanctioned, as I conceived, by the admission of Bishop Taylor, that *the Roman Catholics hold the foundation*, &c.; that your Lordship writes in your Letter to Lord Kenyon; "Bishop Taylor had a very different opinion of Popery from Mr. Wix," p. 12. "Mr. Wix appears to have been misled into his project of Union, partly by misconceiving the sentiments of Archbishop Wake and Bishop Taylor," p. 46; and "from the sentiments of Bishop Taylor, Mr. Wix differs not less essentially," p. 47. But your Lordship cannot produce any one passage of my "Reflections," wherein, in relation to Popery, a similarity of thinking with Bishop Taylor was asserted by me*, and, consequently, your Lordship's remarks to this effect are, at least, unnecessary.

Early in this present year, 1819, a second Edition of the "Reflections" was published, with a conciliatory Address prefixed to the Roman Catholics. This Address, too, has the misfortune to have incurred your Lordship's displeasure. I am charged in the 6th Letter to Dr. Phillimore, with continuing to *misconceive or mis-state the doctrines of my own Church*. I give at length your Lordship's words, that I may not unintentionally convey any thing contrary to the real tendency of the passage.

* Such a similarity was unnecessary to be asserted, and therefore was not asserted by the Author. Should it, however, have been necessary to have compared his own opinions with those of Bishop Taylor, respecting Romish corruptions, there would not have been found the variance intimated by the Bishop of St. David's.

" In the second Edition, Mr. Wix continues so strangely to misconceive or to mis-state the doctrines of his own Church ; and still enters so little into her views of the errors of the Church of Rome, that we cannot wonder at his not perceiving the impracticability of his project *. He says (in the *Preface* † to the second Edition,) ' *We of the Church of England* think the Invocation of Saints unnecessary.' " Mr. Wix can here mean only some individual members of our communion ; for the language of THE CHURCH is very different. In her Articles the Invocation of Saints is

* Here again the Bishop of St. David's objects to the impracticability of Mr. Wix's Project, which he had before called a Project of Union between the Churches of England and of Rome. The Author repeats, that his object was not, in the first instance, Union with the Church of Rome. It was to invite Consideration as to the Expediency of a Council to consider whether any thing could be done to promote the Renunciation of Papal Errors, as the Means of a truly Christian Union. Neither, as the Bishop, in his 8th Letter to Dr. Phillimore asserts, was Union recommended as the means to allay Schism, not as *the primary means* ; for Union was no otherwise recommended than upon the Renunciation of Errors and Delusions on the part of the Romanists : this was the means by which it was hoped Union might be obtained and Schism restrained.

The accomplishment of so desirable a purpose as this, of prevailing with the Roman Catholics to renounce their errors, may not be practicable : and if it be not, then certainly union ought not be practicable. But the object is such as the Author thinks deserves the devoutest attention of the pious and the learned ; and, if they fail in so charitable an attempt as that of endeavouring, without compromising any Christian Truth, to reconcile Christians, may they not hope that they have attempted justly?

† The Bishop means, in the *Address to the Roman Catholics*, prefixed to the second Edit. where the words occur, and not in the Preface.

pronounced to be *repugnant to the Word of God*, that is, antichristian and heretical. Heresy is the profession of doctrines repugnant to the Scriptures."

"In the same *Preface** (p. 24,) Mr. Wix says, 'Your Invocation of Saints is neither idolatrous, nor derogatory to the merits of Christ;' for which assertion he assigns this strange reason: 'because no Church could possibly have been more careful than yours to inculcate confidence in God, and in the mediation of Christ.' As if every day's experience did not afford us proof, that it is possible to profess a confidence in God and Christ, and yet in works to deny it. The Jews, in their most rebellious days, professed the Law of Moses, yet how often were they led away to the idols of the Gentiles? But Mr. Wix thinks that the Roman Catholics are not guilty of idolatry, because they disclaim it, and have confidence in God and Christ. But if they have *also* confidence in other Mediators than Christ,—in any other name under heaven,—and bow down to other Intercessors, and by praying to them, ascribe to creatures the attribute of Omnipresence, which belongs only to the Creator, they are guilty of idolatry. The Invocation of Saints is, therefore, not merely *unnecessary*, but *antichristian, heretical, and idolatrous* †."

* *Address to the Roman Catholics.*

† The above passage was sent to me by the Bishop of St. David's, as a printed Advertisement to "The Grand Schism," with his Lordship's name printed to it, in the Month of February or March, 1819.

On the 9th of the following April, the very same passage appeared, anonymously, in the form of a Letter in the Morning Post, addressed to Dr. Phillimore. I felt myself called upon to notice the use thus publicly made of my name, and sent the fol-

As in instance of my *misconceiving* or *mis-stating* the doctrines of my own Church; your Lordship, in this

lowing letter to the Editor of that Paper, who inserted it, but with the omission of that part which expresses my sense of the impropriety of making a newspaper the medium of controverting the points between the Bishop and me; and with the omission also of that part which complains of the Bishop having so headed his Letter to Dr. Phillimore, under the title of *The Catholic Question*, and so constructed his arguments, as to convey an impression that I had, in some way or other, committed myself in my "Reflections" on that important subject; whereas not a single passage, in allusion to the Catholic Question, can be found in those Reflections. I presume not to judge of the motives of the Editor for mutilating the Letter sent: but I feel it a justice to myself to reprint it here, as it was sent for insertion in the Morning Post.

"TO THE EDITOR OF THE MORNING POST.

"SIR,

"A friend has justnow brought me the Morning Post of the 9th of April, which contains an anonymous Letter to Dr. Phillimore, using very freely my name respecting a Pamphlet, published by me, entitled, "Reflections concerning the Expediency of a Council of the Church of England and the Church of Rome being holden," &c.

"Although the Letter is anonymous, I am not at a loss to know the author of it; since it notices my publication in the very language with which it has been heretofore noticed, in a printed but unpublished Advertisement, to an intended work, which was sent to me by its author, a dignitary of the Church of England.

"As I think most of the discreet friends of our venerable Church will agree with me, that a daily newspaper is not a proper medium of controverting the matters contained in the Letter to Dr. Phillimore, my object in now troubling you goes little further than to request that you will permit me, through the Morning Post, to observe that I am, in that Letter, charged

passage, first offers as a quotation from my Address to the Roman Catholics, the following sentence ; “ *We*

with assertions and conclusions respecting the faith of the Roman Catholics, and other points, which I respectfully, but most decidedly, disown.

“ I am well aware, Sir, that, on a subject which calls forth the warmest passions of our nature, as all religious controversies do, something more than mere assertion may be expected from me. I pledge myself, therefore, whenever the publication to which I have alluded, shall, under the sanction of the Author's high office and name in the church, appear, temperately and candidly to state, how strangely I have been misconceived, and how much the object of my Reflections has been misrepresented.

“ It is in the power of any person, of much less authority and ability than the writer of the letter to Dr. Phillimore, to give a partial extract from an author, to omit a material word ; and then to draw conclusions very different from those which the author intended, or which his writings will warrant. I very deeply regret to have occasion to complain that this has been done by the writer of the letter to Dr. Phillimore.

“ The writer has printed his remarks in that letter under the title of “ *THE CATHOLIC QUESTION*,” and he has headed his letter as purporting to be *On a lately projected Union between the Churches of England and of Rome*.

“ Now the Author of the Letter certainly knows that “ *The Catholic Question* ” forms no part of my “ *Reflections* : ” and he as certainly knows, that whoever reads that Letter, must arise from its perusal with an impression that I had, in some way or other, committed myself in my publication on that important subject.

“ I think I have, also, serious ground for complaint, that the Writer should so head his Letter, and so conduct his arguments, as to leave an impression that Union between the Churches of England and Rome was my primary object. My primary object was, as was distinctly stated, earnestly to solicit attention whether the effect of the Council proposed might not prove highly advantageous to the Christian Cause, by leading to the renunciation of error, and the promotion of Christian Unity.

of the Church of England think the Invocation of Saints unnecessary," and here your quotation closes. The sentence in the original is as follows.

Yet none, who have not read my Reflections, can read the Letter to Dr. Phillimore, without imagining that I was primarily desirous of Union with the Church of Rome, and as, alas! I have been charged even in her unreformed state! But my Reflections were far from suggesting an unqualified Union with the Church of Rome; they were most distant from recommending the compromise of truth, or the perpetuation of error: they were Reflections concerning the Expediency of a Council to be holden, as is abundantly illustrated throughout the Pamphlet, to consider whether means might be devised to forward the renunciation of error, to promote glory to God on high, and to secure on earth, peace, good will, towards men!

"I will not further trespass on the columns of your valuable paper, than by observing, that if, in my ardent zeal to conciliate the Roman Catholics, I have spoken with too little disapprobation of certain of their customs and tenets; if, in my desire to prevail with them to renounce their errors and delusions, I have made any undue concession, that can afford triumph to them, or may justly occasion regret to the sincere and judicious friends of our Church, may the prayer in the concluding part of the Preface to my Reflections, which now I again offer, be heard.

" ' May the God of love, and of peace, who knows the secrets of all hearts, pity and pardon the Writer, if he have fallen into error: and may divine favour attend, and assist, his Christian purpose! "

" A desire to preserve the Roman Catholics in a temper open to conviction of their errors and corruptions, has cautioned me not to charge them with consequences which they disown. This can only irritate and confirm them in their errors, as I fear they have been confirmed in them by those who have most loudly and most zealously declaimed against their delusions. May God magnify his power in my weakness! May it please him to bring into the way of truth, all such as have erred and are deceived! And may He grant to the Church of his Son, our Redeemer,

“ We of the Church of England think the Invocation of Saints unnecessary, *and we regard it as a*

Jesus Christ, that purity, that truth, that unity of sentiment, which are of the essence of the Gospel!

I am, Sir,

Your faithful and obedient servant,

12th April, 1819.

SAMUEL WIX.

Another Letter, from the Bishop of St. David's, appeared in the Morning Post of April the 29th, which rendered a second Reply of a general nature necessary from me; but, I am sorry to observe, that my Reply was not inserted, as I sent it, although I had requested of the Editor, that, if he were unwilling to do so, he would return me the manuscript. In consequence of the Bishop's writing, “ His ” [Mr. Wix's] “ readers must regret that he has reserved himself for the appearance of an *unpublished Tract*, instead of correcting any Misrepresentations, which he conceives there may be in the Letter, *which is already before the public.*”—8th Letter to Dr. Phillimore. I particularly wished that part to be inserted which repeated my idea of the impropriety of a religious controversy in a newspaper, between a Bishop and a Clergyman.

“ A Dignitary of the Church of England,” I wrote, “ has reconciled it to his feelings freely to use my name in a public newspaper; and, under the signature of Philopatris, to charge me, in language precisely similar as he had before used in a printed Advertisement sent to me under his name, but *unpublished*, purporting to be an Advertisement to an intended publication, with conclusions which I disown. Let your Correspondent publicly avow his name and office, for I would not willingly contend with anonymous charges; or let him signify that I have permission to address him by his proper title, under which he first printed the subject of his fifth Letter, and I will respectfully reply to him in a way, as I conceive, better adapted to the very important subject, than through a public newspaper, however respectable that paper may be. I mean nothing offensive by this remark; but I dislike such a medium of controverting

practice likely to lead to those very abuses which have been so much lamented by your Church."

Your Lordship concluding your quotation from the Address, as above stated, intimates that I merely consider the practice as *unnecessary*, and you immediately proceed to observe ;

" Mr. Wix can here mean only some individual members of our communion ; for the language of THE CHURCH is very different. In her Articles, the Invocation of Saints is pronounced to be *repugnant to the Word of God*, that is, antichristian and heretical."

I presume that your Lordship when you write that, in the *Articles* of the Church, the Invocation of Saints is pronounced to be *repugnant to the Word of God*, that is, *antichristian and heretical*, means that it is so pronounced in the 22d Article, which is the only Article of THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND that treats on the Invocation of Saints. This Article is entitled, " Of Purgatory," and is as follows :

" OF PURGATORY."

The Romish doctrine concerning Purgatory, Pardons, Worshipping and Adoration as well of Images as of Reliques, and also the Invocation of Saints, is a fond thing, vainly invented, and grounded upon no warranty of Scripture, but rather repugnant to the Word of God.

It is to be observed that this Article, which includes other doctrines of the Romish Church, is worded with the most charitable caution. It asserts that the doctrine concerning Purgatory, and the several other particular doctrines included in the Article, is a fond

the points contained in Philopatris's Letter. I think it would not be becoming in me, nor respectful to the Writer of that Letter, so to enter on the controversy."

thing, vainly invented and grounded upon no warranty of Scripture, but rather repugnant to the Word of God. Your Lordship, from an Article which thus pronounces the Romish doctrine concerning Purgatory, and the several other doctrines specified, to be rather repugnant to the Word of God, concludes first that the particular doctrine of the Invocation of Saints is *antichristian* and *heretical*.

Having offered this conclusion, your Lordship, in the passage from the Letter which has just been given, thus partially and incorrectly, *omitting a material word*, quotes from my Address to the Roman Catholics *.

“ In the same *Preface* † (p. 24,) Mr. Wix says, ‘ Your Invocation of Saints is neither *idolatrous*, nor derogatory to the merits of Christ.’ ”

Now the whole passage in the original is thus ;

“ I will crave permission to illustrate my meaning as to concession, by referring to the practice of Invoking Angels and departed Saints. This cannot properly be called, I apprehend, an Article of Faith. Are there not many customs in your Church which rest precisely on the same footing as this, and which might therefore equally admit of some concession, or, at least, of some conciliatory explanation ? The Council of Trent insists not on the necessity of in-

* This Address, let it be considered, was intended to be of a conciliatory nature, and was illustrative of the necessity of concession by the Romish Church, as the alone ground on which Union was desirable.

The Invocation of Saints was stated to be one of the concessions necessary.

† *Address to the Roman Catholics.*

voking the saints, but only teaches that it is good and useful they should be invoked.

“ I am hurt when I hear you charged with idolatry for invoking them, or with detracting from the merits of Christ. Your Catechism sufficiently exonerates you from any idolatry in the custom *; and no Church could possibly have been more careful than your’s has been to inculcate confidence in God, and in the Mediatorship of Christ, through the merits of whose sacred passion salvation can alone be obtained. Your Invocation, therefore, of the Saints, is neither idolatrous nor *necessarily* derogatory to the merits of Christ. We, of the Church of England, think the Invocation of Saints unnecessary; *and we regard it as a practice likely to lead to those very abuses which have been so much lamented by your Church.*” P. 21, of *Address to the Roman Catholics*.

Your Lordship, by giving a small part only of the passage, and by omitting the material word *necessarily* in that part which you have quoted, conveys an idea to those who see not the original, that I might be of opinion that the Invocation of Saints was a practice *not* censurable, that it was merely *unnecessary*, and that no derogation *could* thence arise to the merits of Christ; whereas, by reading the whole passage, with the word *necessarily*, the true objections to the practice are not surrendered; and by adding, as it is in my Address, “ *and we regard it as a practice likely to lead to those very abuses which have been so much*

* Etsi enim Angelos Christiani adorare dicuntur exemplo sanctorum veteris Testamenti; non eam tamen illis venerationem adhibent, quam deo tribuunt. *Catechismus Romanus*, 1606. *Pars tertia*. P. 295.

lamented by your Church," I declared my own fears of the tendency of the practice, by pronouncing, *not merely* that it was *unnecessary*; but that it was *unnecessary* and *likely, also, to lead to those very abuses* which have been so much lamented by the Roman Church. These abuses, are justly esteemed idolatrous. But the idolatry is accidental, and not absolutely in the doctrine, which, as it is guarded and explained by the Roman Catholic Church in the Decrees of the Council of Trent, and in the Curate's Catechism, is not idolatrous, nor *necessarily* derogatory to the merits of Christ. It is believed, under whatever delusion, though how it is not affirmed, that the Invocation of Saints to pray for the invocators of them is heard. It is read that "Joy shall be in heaven over one sinner that repenteth;" and it is believed that the heavenly host are privy to the transactions of men in this world. Believing this, they who Invoke Angels and Saints are under a delusion by invoking them; but, believing it, they are not guilty of the flagrant crime of idolatry, however confidently the crime may be charged upon them by those who affect to know the doctrines of the Roman Catholics better than the Roman Catholics do themselves. Mountague, a Protestant Bishop of Chichester, and afterwards of Norwich, expressing his disapprobation of the Invocation of Saints, observed;

"Admit it not impiety, as I think it is not, it is flat and egregious foolery at the best. *Peter* might say to *Paul* at *Antioch*, when they lived together; and *vice versa*, *Paul* unto *Peter*, Pray for me, without scruple or doubt, or question at all. But what need for one to say so now to either, when neither needeth intercession of other? I cannot now say to either

one or other without incongruity, or touch of foolery, Pray for me. Were I with them: could I come at them: or certainly inform them of my estate, without any question, or more ado, I would readily and willingly say, *Holy Peter, Blessed Paul, pray for me:* recommend my case unto Christ Jesus, our Lord. Were they with me; by me; in my kenning, I would run with open arms, and γονυπετεῖν, fall upon my knees*, and with affection desire them to pray for me. But, seeing it is not so: at least, I cannot be resolved so, nor all saint invocators in the world can prove it so: I would gladly see and know, by what warrant I on earth, so uncouth, and therefore unkist, so unknown to them altogether, for ought can be proved, so far removed from all ordinary means of intimation to make my case known, can say unto them, *Holy Peter, Blessed Paul, pray for me.*—*Treatise on the Invocation of Saints.* P. 119.

In my Address to the Roman Catholics, prefixed to the second edition of my Reflections, I observed, that the Catechisms of the Roman Catholics sufficiently exonerated them from idolatry in their practice of invoking the saints, and that no Church could possibly have been more careful than theirs to inculcate confidence in God, and in the Mediatorship of Christ, through the merits of whose sacred passion salvation could alone be obtained.

This, your Lordship observes, is assigning a strange reason why the Invocation of Saints is not idolatrous, (*Letter VI. to Dr. Phillimore*). Now, with submis-

* The expression *falling upon my Knees* sounds too strong; but it could be adopted by Bishop Mountague in no other sense than that of *civil* respect, and earnest solicitation.

sion, as I know no better mode of arriving at the doctrine of any Church than by reference to the generally received instructions, and authorized decrees of that Church, I will first produce two extracts from an abridged translation of the Exposition of the Catholic Church, by James Benignus Bossuet, Bishop of Meaux, &c. a little work very generally circulated among the Roman Catholics, and shall then show the conformity of the extracts to passages which I will produce from the authorized books and decrees of the Roman Church.

EXTRACTS FROM AN ABRIDGED TRANSLATION OF
BOSSUET, WITH THE ORIGINAL, IN NOTES.

“ First, the Catholic Church teaches us, as the foundation of all religion, that adoration is due alone to one God in three persons, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost ; that it consists chiefly in believing that he is the Creator and Lord of all things, and in adhering to him, with all the powers of our souls by faith, hope, and charity, as to our infinite good, which alone can make us happy.

“ The same church teaches, that this interior adoration, as well as its external marks, in other words, that all religious worship ought to terminate in God as its necessary object: (*The Invocation of Saints*). If, therefore, the honour which she gives to the Blessed Virgin and the other saints, can be called religious, it is solely because it relates essentially to God *.”

* *An Exposition of the Doctrines of the Catholic Church, with respect to controverted Points; abridged from the French, by James Benignus Bossuet, Bishop of Meaux, &c. P. 7.*

In the original, the passage is—

“ Pour commencer par l'adoration qui est due à Dieu, l'Eglise Catholique enseigne que elle consiste principalement à

Again, " the Council of Trent itself, prescribing to Bishops, how they are to speak of the Invocation of Saints, commands them to teach, that *the Saints who reign with Jesus Christ, offer their prayers to God for men ; that it is good and useful suppliantly to invoke them, and to have recourse to their aid, in order to obtain benefits from God, through Jesus Christ his Son our Lord, who is our only Saviour and Redeemer.*

" The Council afterwards condemns those, who teach a different doctrine. Thus, therefore, does our Church clearly and briefly explain herself in her authentic documents ; nor can we conceive, with what show of reason it can, after this, be objected to us, that we depart from Jesus Christ, when we address his and our members, his children and our brethren, his saints and our first fruits, that they may pray with us, and for us, to our common Father, in the name of our common Mediator.

croire qu'il est le créateur et le Seigneur de toutes choses, et à nous attacher à luy de toutes les puissances de nostre ame par la foy, par l'espérance, et par la charité, comme à celuy qui seul peut faire nostre félicité, par la communication du bien infini, qui est luy-mesme.

" Cette adoration intérieure que nous rendons à Dieu en esprit et en vérité, a ses marques extérieures, dont la principale est le sacrifice, qui ne peut estre offert qu' à Dieu seul, parce que le sacrifice est établi pour faire un aveu public, et une protestation solennelle de la Souveraineté de Dieu, et de nostre dependance absolüe.

" La mesme Eglise enseigne que tout culte religieux se doit terminer à Dieu, comme à sa fin nécessaire ; et si l'honneur qu' elle rend à la Sainte Vierge et aux saints peut estre appelé religieux, c'est à cause qu'il se rapporte nécessairement à Dieu."

—*Exposition de la Doctrine de l'Eglise Catholique*, 1686. P. 13.

“ Let it not be objected to us, that we attribute to the saints a knowledge of our hearts, which seems in Scripture to be reserved to God alone ; for our Church decides nothing on this head. Whether they may know our wants and desires by the ministry of angels, who, according to the said Scriptures, are established by God as his agents in the works of his Providence, or whether God himself may make our petitions known to them ; the Church contents herself with asserting, in consonance with all antiquity, that to pray to them is good and useful. Whatever means God may use for that purpose, this at least must be allowed, that we are far from paying any idolatrous worship to creatures, because in the greatest saints we acknowledge no excellence, which comes not from God, no consideration, but from their virtues, and no virtue, but from his grace, no knowledge of human things, but from him, and no power to assist us, but by their prayers.” *Ibid.* P. 9*.

* In the original, the passage is—

“ Mais il est bon de considérer les paroles du concile mesme, qui voulant prescrire aux evesques comment ils doivent parler de l'invocation des saints, les oblige d'enseigner, *que les saints qui regnent avec JESUS CHRIST, offrent à Dieu leurs prieres pour les hommes ; qu'il est bon et utile de les invoquer d'une maniere suppliant, et de recourir à leur aide et à leur secours, pour impêtrer de Dieu ses bienfaits, par son fils nostre seigneur JESUS CHRIST, qui seul est nostre Sauveur et nostre rédempteur.* Ensuite le concile condamne ceux qui enseignent une doctrine contraire. On voit donc qu'invoquer les saints, suivant la pensée de ce concile, c'est recourir à leurs prieres pour obtenir les bien faits de Dieu par JESUS CHRIST. En effet, nous n'obtenons que par JESUS CHRIST et en son nom, ce que nous obtenons par l'entremise des saints, puis que les saints eux-mêmes ne prient que par JESUS CHRIST, et ne sont exaucés qu'en son nom. Telle est la foy de

The above extracts are from an abridged translation of a work considered as a standard of orthodoxy

l'Eglise, que le Concile de Trent a clairement expliquée en peu de paroles. Après quoy nous ne conservons pas qu'on puisse nous objecter que nous nous éloignons de JESUS CHRIST, quand nous prions ses membres qui sont aussi les nostres, ses enfans qui sont nos freres, et ses saints qui sont nos prémices, de prier avec nous et pour nous nostre commun maistre au nom de nostre commun Médiateur.".....

....."Ceux qui considéreront la doctrine que nous avons proposée seront obligez de nous avouer, que comme nous n'ostons à Dieu aucune des perfections qui sont propres à son essence infinie, nous n'attribuons aux créatures aucunes de ces qualitez, ou de ces opérations qui ne peuvent convenir qu'à Dieu : ce qui nous distingue si fort des idolâtres, qu'on ne peut comprendre pourquoy on nous en donne le titre.

"Et quand Messieurs de la Religion Prétendue Reformée nous objectent, qu'en adressant les prieres aux saints, et en les honorant, comme présens par toute la terre, nous leur attribuons une espece d'immensité, ou du moins la connoissance du secret des cœurs, qu'il paroist néanmoins que Dieu se réserve, par tant de témoignages de l'écriture ; ils ne considerent pas assez nostre doctrine. Car enfin, sans examiner quel fondement on peut avoir d'attribuer aux saints jusqu'à certain degré la connoissance des choses qui se passent parmi nous, ou mesme de nos secrettes pensées, il est manifeste que ce n'est point élever la créature au dessus de sa condition, que de dire qu'elle a quelque connoissance de ces choses par la lumiere que Dieu luy en communique. L'exemple des prophetes le justifie clairement, Dieu n'ayant pas mesme dédaigné de leur découvrir les choses futures, quoy-queelles semblent bien plus particulièrement réservées à sa connoissance.

"Au reste, jamais aucun Catholique n'a pensé que les saints connussent par eux-mesmes nos besoins, ni mesme les desirs pour lesquels nous leur faisons de secrettes prieres. L'Eglise

among the Roman Catholics. I have given the extracts in English in the words of the Abridgement, because I understand that the Abridgement is very commonly circulated among the Roman Catholics, subjoining in notes the original French.

Agreeably to these extracts, we find in one of the Catechisms, very generally received by the members of the Church of Rome, the following questions and answers.

Q. Do you then worship the angels and saints as gods, or give them the honour that belongs to God alone?

A. No, God forbid ! For this would be high treason against his divine majesty.

Q. What is the difference between the honour which you give to God, and that which you give to the saints?

se contente d'enseigner avec toute l'antiquité *, que ces prieres sont tres-profitables à ceux qui les font, soit que les saints les apprennent par le ministere et le commerce des anges, qui suivant le témoignage de l'écriture, savent ce qui se passe parmi nous, étant établis par ordre de Dieu esprits administrateurs, pour concourir à l'œuvre de nostre salut ; soit que Dieu mesme leur fasse connoistre nos desirs par une révélation particuliere ; soit enfin qu'il leur en découvre le secret dans son essence infinie, où toute vérité est comprise. Ainsi l'Eglise n'a rien décidé sur les différens moyens dont il plaist à Dieu de se servir pour cela.

“ Mais quels que soient ces moyens, toujours est il véritable qu'elle n'attribuë à la créature aucune des perfections divines, comme faisoient les idolâtres, puis qu'elle ne permet de reconnoistre dans les plus grands saints aucun degré d'excellence qu;

* Bishop Meaux is not correct in this idea. The Roman Church has not all antiquity on her side, when she teaches that prayers offered to departed saints are profitable. It does not appear that such prayers were recommended by the church within the three first centuries.

A. There is no comparison between one and the other. We honour God with a sovereign honour, as the supreme Lord or Creator of all things, as our first beginning and last end : we believe in him alone ; we love him above all things. To him alone we pay our homage of divine adoration, praise, and sacrifice. But as for the saints and angels, we only reverence them with relative honours, as belonging to him for his sake, and upon account of the gifts which they have received from him *.

The Trent Catechism, in conformity with this Catechism and the preceding extracts, teaches expressly,

“ Although Christians are said to adore the angels after the example of the saints of the Old Testament, they do not pay to them that adoration which they pay to God †.”

Again, the Trent Catechism teaching who is to be prayed to, and having stated that God and the saints are to be invoked after a different manner, specially teaches,

“ Yet here all must take great heed, that, what is proper to God, they give not to any besides him ‡.”

ne vienne de Dieu, ni aucune considération devant ses yeux que par leurs vertus, ni aucune vertu qui ne soit un don de sa grace, ni aucune connoissance des choses humaines que celle qu'il leur communique, ni aucun pouvoir de nous assister que par leurs prières.”—*Exposition de la Doctrine d' l'Eglise Catholique*, 1686. P. 22. 28.

* *Grounds of the Catholic Doctrine*, by Bishop Challoner ; as contained in the *Profession of Faith* published by Pope Pius IV.

† In the original:—“ Etsi enim Angelos Christiani adorare dicuntur exemplo sanctorum Veteris Testamenti ; non eam illis venerationem adhibent, quam deo tribuunt.”—*Catechismus Romanus*, 1606. *Pars tertia*. P. 295.

‡ In the original:—“ Quo loco illud maxime cavendum est

The same Catechism in the Explication of the Lord's Prayer, Petition V. teaches,

“ That we are not only debtors to God, but also, that we are not capable of discharging our debt ; since a sinner of himself is not able to make any satisfaction. Wherefore we must flee to the mercy of God ; and because his justice is equal to his mercy, therefore we must make use of the intercession and patronage of the passion of our Lord Jesus Christ, without which none have ever obtained pardon of their sins*.”

Again, in Sess. VI. c. 3. of the Council of Trent, we read ;

“ For as in truth, men, unless they were born from the seed of Adam, would not be born unjust, since by that propagation, so long as they are conceived through him, they contract their own injustice : so, unless they be born again in Christ, they could never be justified, since that new birth, through the merits of his passion, the grace by which they become just is attributed to them. For this benefit, the Apostle exhorts us to ‘ give thanks unto the Father, which hath made us meet to be partakers of the inheritance of the saints in light. Who hath delivered us from the power of darkness, and hath translated us into the kingdom of his

omnibus, ne, quod Dei proprium est, cuiquam præterea tribuant.” *Catechismus Romanus*, Cap. 6. § 3. P. 394.

* In the original :—“ Non solum nos debitores esse, sed etiam non esse solvendo ; cum peccator per se satisfacere nullo modo possit. Confugiendum erit ad Dei misericordiam, cui quia par justitia respondet, cujus est retinentissimus Deus, utendum erit deprecatione, et petrocinio passionis domini nostri Jesu Christi ; sine quâ nemo unquam veniam delectorum impetravit, a quo omnis et satisfaciendi vis et ratio, tanquam ex fonte, profluxit.”

—*Catechismus Romanus*. Caput XIII. De quinta Petitione,

dear Son: In whom we have redemption, even the forgiveness of sins *.'” Coloss. i. 12, 13, 14.

Again, in the first Canon concerning Justification, we read,

“ If any one shall say that man is justified before God, by his own works, done either by the impulse of nature, or the instruction of the law, without the divine grace, through Jesus Christ, let him be anathema †.”

From the preceding extracts from books of general dispersion and reception among the Roman Catholics, and from decisions of the Roman Church, it seems that, whatever may be the abuses of the *members* of the Church of Rome, the Roman Church does not teach idolatry in the Invocation of Saints, nor sanction derogation of the merits of Christ: these are consequences, either of mistaken individuals which their Church laments, or of her adversaries which the Church does not sanction, and which ought not to be charged upon her.

Your Lordship having charged me with misconceiving or mis-stating the doctrines of my *own Church*, in respect to the custom of Invocating Saints, I have

* In the original:—*Nam sicut revera homines nisi ex semine Adamæ propagati nascerentur, non nascerentur injusti; cum ea propagatione, per ipsam dum concipiuntur, propriam injustitiam contrahunt: ita, nisi in Christo renascerentur, nunquam justificarentur, cum ea renascentia per meritum passionis ejus, gratia quâ justi fiunt, illis tribuatur. Pro hoc beneficio apostolus gratias nos semper agere hortatur patri, qui dignos nos fecit in partem sortis sanctorum lumine, et eripuit de potestate tenebrarum, transtulitque in regnum filii dilectionis suæ; in quo habemus redemptionem, et remissionem peccatorum. Sess. 6. Cap. III. P. 52.*

† In the original:—“ Si quis dixerit, hominem suis operibus, quæ vel per humanæ naturæ, vel per legis doctrinam fiant, abs-

again carefully perused the Articles of my Church, in no one of which is the Invocation called *idolatrous*.

In the 22d Article, which alone alludes to the doctrine, it is, we have seen, in conjunction with other doctrines open to much greater objection, declared to “ be a fond thing, vainly invented, and grounded upon no warranty of Scripture, but rather repugnant to the word of God.”

In the Homily “ *against Peril of Idolatry*,” which justly censures this and many customs connected with it, as, according to the title of the Homily, *tending to, and leading to Peril of, Idolatry*, we find the justest arguments against men’s *foolishness and wickedness in making of the true servants of God false gods, by attributing to them the power and honour which is God’s, and due to him only*. But this, the Roman Church, according to the teaching of the Council of Trent, does not do. The Church of Rome, we have seen, positively disclaims giving any honour to the creature which is due to God only. Consequently, the words of the Homily do not apply to Invocation, as directed by the Roman Church, with whatever truth they may apply, and too justly, I fear, they do apply, to the practices of mistaken individuals *. The Ho-

que divinâ per Jesum Christum gratiâ posse justificari coram deo; anathema sit.” *De Justificatione*, Canon I. P. 64.

* What the Rev. John Hawkins, before cited in the Preface, has observed on this occasion, deserves attention, as the words of a convert from the Roman Catholic Church.

Lamenting the undue veneration paid in the offices of the church to the Virgin Mary, he proceeds—

“ All this is a scandal to the sober part of your community, and a stone of stumbling to your *people*. I will not say that amongst *them* the worship of the Virgin Mary has degenerated

mily, which is *against Peril of Idolatry*, is against the practice of Invocation, because it is a *dangerous* practice, tending and leading to idolatry; but which practice is not in itself absolutely idolatrous, nor so denominated *.

Neither in the Homily concerning Prayer, in which the custom of invocation is particularly alluded to, is it called idolatrous. May it not, therefore, be concluded that the authority which pronounces it to be

into idolatry; but it approaches nearly to it.”—*Postscript to Letter to William Pilling*. P. 316.

Again—“The precise import of the term *idolatry* has not been settled between our two Churches; and therefore when Protestant writers have asserted that Roman Catholics are Idolaters, they frequently mean nothing more, than that there are several parts of their practical religion which have a tendency to lead their people into an idolatrous worship, and are even idolatrous in their nature.”—*Ibid*. P. 332.

* The moderation of this Sermon, or Homily, *against Peril of Idolatry*, is characteristic of the charitable temper of the Church of England. Even in respect to the setting up of Images in Churches—which is a most dangerous practice—the words of the Homily are:—

“So that, I conclude, as it may be possible in some one city or little country, to have images set up in temples and churches, and yet idolatry by earnest and continual preaching of God’s true word, and the sincere Gospel of our Saviour Jesus Christ, may be kept away for a short time: so is it impossible that (images once set up and suffered in temples and churches) any great countries, much less the whole world, can any long time be kept from idolatry. And the godly will respect, not only their own city, country, and time, and the health of men of their age; but be careful for all places and times, and the salvation of men of all ages. At the lest, they will not lay such stumbling blocks and snares for the feet of other countrymen and ages, which experience hath already proved to have been the ruin of the world.”—Second part of the Sermon *against Peril of Idolatry*.

idolatrous, I mean, let it ever be remembered, which pronounces that invocation, which the Church of Rome recommends, to be necessarily and absolutely idolatrous, is not the authority of the Church of England, but the authority of some individual members of that Church?

Your Lordship, indeed, in the passage which I quoted from the anonymous Letter to Dr. Phillimore, which appeared in the Morning Post on the 9th of April, 1819, and which has since been printed in the form of a Pamphlet, as the 6th Letter to Dr. Phillimore, concludes, secondly, that the Invocation of Saints is “*antichristian, heretical, and idolatrous.*”

“Mr. Wix thinks that the Roman Catholics are not guilty of idolatry, because they disclaim it, and have confidence in God and Christ. But, if they have *also* confidence in other Mediators than Christ—in any other name under heaven—and *bow down* to other Intercessors, and, by praying to them, ascribe to creatures the attribute of Omnipresence, which belongs only to the Creator, they are guilty of idolatry. The Invocation of saints is, therefore, not merely *unnecessary*, but *antichristian, heretical, and idolatrous.*”

Now this, my Lord, is a *Petitio Principii*, a begging of the question, which sound reasoning will not sanction. Your Lordship, at Page 9 of your Letter to Lord Kenyon, observes: “The character of the Church of Rome is to be estimated, not by the habits and temper, and professions of the English Roman Catholics of the present day; but by the decrees and canons of the Council of Trent,” &c. Agreeably to that test, I admit that if the Roman Catholics did all that it is supposed that they do in the passage quoted; if they had thus confidence in other Mediators than Christ; confidence that did not ultimately rest in

Christ; if they ascribed to them any attribute which belongs only to the Creator, then would they be guilty of idolatry; but their invocation ultimately refers to God; and, though they believe that the saints may hear their petitions, yet it does not follow that they, therefore, ascribe to them, as existing in themselves, any attribute which belongs only to the Creator. How they are heard, they presume not to understand; they may, (they may suppose) be heard by some faculty specially granted by God to the saints addressed; but they believe that their being heard is owing to a power emanating from God only. Yet do not, my Lord, suppose, that, because I think your charge of idolatry against the Invocation of Saints, as recommended by the Roman Church, to be unfounded; or your censures of me, because I cannot call it idolatrous, to be improper; I therefore intend, in the smallest degree, to excuse a custom, which I consider very erroneous, and very dangerous, unwarranted by scripture and antiquity, and such as ought to be altogether forsaken.

Under this declaration, which will, I trust, in the mind of every impartial person, protect me from the charge of desiring to *defend* the practice, I will now offer a passage or two from a Roman Catholic book, entitled, “The True Church of Christ showed by Ancient Testimonies of Scripture and Primitive Tradition.” The book is in much favour with the Roman Catholics, and the passages will shew the general feeling with which the Invocation of Saints is conducted.

“It is,” says the author of the book, “an article of our belief, that all our blessings flow from God, through Jesus Christ: so, in the desires and language of the heart, ’tis only to God through Jesus Christ, that all our *prayers* are chiefly directed; without which they would not be *prayers*. Hence it necessarily fol-

lows: 1st. That, when we desire to partake of the prayers of the blessed angels and saints, 'tis enough that our desire is known to God. 2dly. That it is the same thing in effect, whether we say, *Holy Peter, pray for me*; or, *O God, grant me a share in the prayers of St. Peter*. 3dly. That, supposing the saints pray for us, the great controversy, concerning their *Invocation*, is only *λογομαχία*, a zealous fighting about words and phrases." Part III. C. 2. P. 286.

Again, "If nothing be asked of the saints but what it may be reasonably supposed, that, by the mercy of God, they can give; he that sees the heart, and there reads the whole address, will not quarrel with the direction, whether it be worded thus; *Merciful God, may thy blessed servant help me!* or, *O blessed servant of God, may thou, by his mercy, help me!* For the language of the heart is the same. As it may be under these different forms, *Praise the Lord, all ye nations*, Ps. cxvii. v. 1.; and, *O Lord, may all nations praise thee!* especially seeing Mr. Thorndike tells us*, *It is confessed that the lights, both of the Greek and the Latin Church*, Basil, Nazianzen, Nyssen, Ambrose, Hierom, Austin, Chrysostom, Cyrils both, Theodoret, Fulgentius, St. Gregory the Great, Leo, more, or rather all, after that time, HAVE spoken to the saints, and desired their assistance." Part III. Ch. 2. P. 308.

Again, "An *absolute invocation* of angels, such as Heathens used to their inferior deities, as to beings, in many respects, independent of the supreme God, by begging their *aid* as such, and offering sacrifices to them, is also detestable.

"To *invoke* the angels, as if they gave any *infor-*

* In Epil. Par. 3. P. 358.

mation or advice to God, in dispensing his blessings; or were his partners in them, is also detestable."

Part III. C. 2. P. 320.

These passages, or the sense which they convey, cannot be unknown to your Lordship. Yet your Lordship writes as though all invocation of the saints was not only wrong and absurd, and dangerous, as it certainly is, but absolutely idolatrous*.

Mountague, a Protestant Bishop, did not admit it to be impiety, and consequently not idolatry. Bishop Burnet and others call it idolatry. Others, however, of the Church of England, valuable for their erudition and their piety, and inferior to none in their attachment to scriptural truth, have disdained to call it idolatrous. Thorndike, indeed, a learned divine of our Church, expressly disowns the truth of such a charge, extending his disavowal of it to the popish doctrines generally.

"A church," he says, "is a company of Christians, and all Christians profess the true Christ: and all that

* Lord Grenville, in supporting the motion of Lord Grey in the House of Lords, on the 10th June, 1819, against the Declaration of Idolatry on the part of the Romish Church, is reported to have thus spoken:—"He would ask now, after all the slanders and calumnies which had been uttered for years against the Roman Catholics, if there was any man existing who would lay his hand on his heart, and say that the religion of *Fenelon* was idolatry? In us, who professed a different faith, it would be idolatry; but in the true Catholic it was pure religion," &c.

It is worthy of all consideration, that it is not to a simple declaration against Roman errors and corruptions that a sound Protestant objects; but it is against the uncharitable and unnecessary denomination of them as idolatrous, that many good, many able, and many sound Protestants do most conscientiously and most consistently object.

profess the true Christ profess the true God : and professing the true God, if they believe that which they profess, they cannot honour any creature as they honour God. For they profess that there is only one true God : and that there is infinite distance between Him and all creatures ; so that they cannot esteem any creature to be God ; and therefore they cannot so honour any creature, as if it were God. Christianity supposeth the belief of one true God, and the being of the Church supposeth Christianity. It took away idolatry in point of fact."

He adds: " There may be idolaters of all religions, supposing that men may act contrary to that which they profess. But that is not the question which we have in hand, when we dispute whether we are to forsake the Church of *Rome* as idolaters, or not. For it is the public profession thereof, that we are to forsake : we are not to forsake it for the actions of private persons, contrary to that which they publicly profess. Now they which profess the only true Christ, and therefore the only true God, do necessarily profess to detest all idolatry ; which the profession of Christianity effectively rooted out of the world, wheresoever it prevailed. And so doth the Church of *Rome* still as seriously profess, as they who charge them to be idolaters. And therefore cannot easily be convinced to profess idolatry*." And in another passage, after justifying the Reformation, in the strong language of Scripture, " Come out of her my people †," still he concludes—

" They who justify the Reformation by charging the Pope to be Anti-Christ, and the Papists Idolaters : so, on the other side, they who overcharge the Reforma-

* *Thorndike's Just Weights and Measures*, Ch. 1. P. 5 and 6.

† Rev. xviii. 4.

tion to be Heretics, make themselves thereby Schismatics before God." Conclusion of Chapter I.

The learned and amiable Henry Dodwell, a Member of our Church, alluding to the general question, *whether the Roman Catholics be Idolaters, or no?* manifests very charitable caution, presuming only to judge by general presumptions.

"I must confess," says he, "that I think the true notion of *Idolatry* more difficult than is commonly conceived, and to my understanding not yet sufficiently explained. Nor am I willing, on this occasion, to engage on that dispute, both because it would be too tedious, and because I think most of the mistakes already entertained concerning it to have been occasioned by its having been stated in *disputes*, with a design on some *particular adversaries* *."

But to return from this digression, into which I have been led from your Lordship having censured me, and asserted that I misconceived and mis-stated the Doctrines of my own Church, because I did not agree that the Invocation of Saints, recommended by the Church of Rome, was absolutely idolatrous. I would again, and again repeat, that my primary object has not been Union with the Church of Rome; and nothing can have been more distant from my object than Union with her, while she retains her errors and corruptions. My first object has been to invite Consideration as to the Expediency of a Council being called to ascertain whether any thing could be done, in true Christian Charity, to facilitate the Renunciation of those Errors and Corruptions which are in the way of Union. I greatly lament that so strong are your Lordship's prejudices against the Church of Rome, that every at-

* Dodwell's Answer to Six Queries, P. 39.

tempt to prepare the way for so important an object is censured as Popery, and injured by Misrepresentation.

I once, indeed, entertained the popular idea that Invocation of the Saints was absolutely idolatrous; but, having reflected and read much on the subject, I more than suspect the propriety of my former conclusion.

Archbishop Tenison, in his Discourse of Idolatry, observes—

“The learned *Hugo Grotius*, especially in his *Annotations on the Consultation of Cassander*, in his *Animadversions on the Animadversions of Rivet*, and in his *Votum pro pace*; the learned Mr. *Thorndike*, in his Epilogue, and in his *Just Weights and Measures*; *Carcellæus*, in his Epistle to *Adrian Patius**. These three, together with some others, have pronounced a milder sentence in this cause, though they approved not of such Invocation of Saints, and Worship of Images, as is practised in the Church of Rome.” Chap. 10. Part 2.

Such authorities have, however, little weight with your Lordship. You will probably reply, as you do in your 14th Letter to Dr. Phillimore, concerning Transubstantiation, without answering any Christian doubts, that they are “the *unprotestant* scruples of a few *uninquiring* Protestants.” Yet, my Lord, mistake me not, nor let any one mistake me. The Invocation of Saints is, indeed, in my opinion, after most serious consideration, indefensible from Scripture: it is indefensible from primitive usage: it is wrong in itself, and likely to be mischievous in its consequences†; but it is not in itself, and neces-

* Curcell. Ep. ad Adr. Pat. inter epist. Ecclesiast. P. 859.

† The Rev. John Hawkins, before referred to, alluding to the abuses of Invocation, observes;—“The ignorance of your

sarily, idolatrous. The Invocation of Persons now alive to pray for us is allowable. Could we be assured that angels and departed saints were conscious of our petitions as the living members of Christ are, who are within the hearing of us, our invocation, or our pious hope, that we might be benefited by their prayers, through Jesus Christ, would not be properly deemed idolatry *. Nor would it be *necessarily* derogatory to the merits of Christ, blessed for evermore! to intreat that their prayers, through the same Jesus Christ, might be heard by God on our behalf. Absurd, then, as the practice appears, since we do not possess this knowledge; superstitious and censurable as it is; is it properly called, independently of its accidents, idolatry? However, I beg leave now again earnestly to submit the same caution as I did in my Scriptural Illustrations of the 39 Articles, in the year 1808.

“ Removing the doctrine far from us, let us hope that our Romish brethren may soon see their errors;

people may excuse them from *formal* idolatry: but those who either promote or tolerate such unscriptural modes of prayer, are severely to be blamed. No comment, or apology, can palliate such abuses. In vain you allege that this is not the doctrine of the Catholic Church; it is the practice of the Catholic community! In a society of philosophers, much might be tolerated, which in the present state of things ought to be abolished.”—P. 317. Postscript to Letter to W. Pilling.

* The Invocation directed to be taught in the Council of Trent is, “Ob beneficia impetranda a deo per filium ejus Jesum Christum Dominum, nostrum, qui solus noster redemptor et Salvator est.” That is,—on account of the benefits to be obtained for us from God, through Jesus Christ our Lord, who is our only Redeemer and Saviour.—*Sess. 25. de Inv. S.S.*

and let us, ourselves, fly for refuge to the appointed hope; humbly and altogether reposing on Jesus, as the only sure foundation of our hope, the never failing rock of our salvation*.”

I thus expressed myself, and I thus now think, concerning Invocation of Saints, in perfect consonance with the concluding part of the Homily on Prayer, which, it is repeated, does not call the practice idolatrous. Towards the conclusion of the Homily, we read—

“ Let us not, therefore, put our trust, or confidence, in the saints or martyrs that be dead. Let us not call upon them, nor desire help at their hands: but let us always lift up our hearts to God, in the name of his dear Son Jesus Christ, for whose sake, as God hath promised to hear our prayer, so he will truly perform it. Invocation is a thing proper unto God, which, if we attribute unto the saints, it soundeth to their reproach, neither can they well bear it at our hands.”

Hence, from invocation being said to be a thing proper unto God, it may, by some, be inferred that it was intended that all Invocation of Saints must be idolatrous, though the Homily does not in words denominate it so. If the charge of idolatry against the practice was absolutely intended, it is not likely to have been omitted. But has invocation, in that high sense in which it is *proper unto God*, been ever recommended by the Roman Church to any other than unto God? Bishop Taylor, in his *Liberty of Prophecy*, considers that “ Idolatry is a forsaking the true

* Scriptural Illustrations of the Thirty Nine Articles of the Church of England. By Samuel Wix, A. M.

God, and giving divine worship to a creature, or to an idol, that is, to an imaginary God, who hath no foundation in essence or existence." *Sect. XIX. Number 16. P. 348.* They who consider how industriously the Roman Church endeavours, as has been shown, to secure her members from giving divine worship unto the *creature*, which is *proper only unto God*, will, however they may condemn the practices of *individuals* as idolatrous, and justly, it is feared, they may so condemn them, feel that they are not authorized, either by the Decrees of that Church, or by the Articles or Homilies of the Church of England, in pronouncing invocation, as it is intended by the Church of Rome, idolatrous. It is, notwithstanding, however recommended, or however practised, a very great error in judgment, and such an error as ought altogether to be abandoned.

Having thus expressed my opinion, that I have neither "misconceived nor mis-stated the doctrines of my own Church*," by pronouncing that "we of the Church of England think the Invocation of Saints unnecessary, *and we regard* it as a practice likely to lead to those very abuses which have been so much lamented by your [the Roman Catholic] Church;" and having, moreover, observed that neither the Articles, nor the Homilies of our Church, denominate the practice, in itself and absolutely, idolatrous, as your Lordship infers it to be, I will again express my decided disapprobation of it, though I cannot call it *idolatrous*. I disapprove of it, not merely as absurd, as superstitious; and as naturally tend-

* Sixth Letter to Dr. Phillimore.

ing to idolatry *; but as likely also to become, though it is not necessarily so in itself, derogatory to the merits of Christ †. I will go farther, and express my regret, if, in my ardent zeal to conciliate our Romish brethren, I expressed myself in my Reflections, with too little disapprobation of the custom.

I have felt a great desire that the Roman Catholics should not be unnecessarily provoked, because I know that a temper is then generated in them, most unfriendly to the success of those endeavours, which

* The learned Henry Dodwell, before cited, referring to the general question, *whether the Roman Catholics be idolaters*, after having confessed the difficulty of the subject, observes of the Roman Church, *generally*, what may be observed of her in respect to the Invocation of Saints, *in particular*.

“ That the *Roman Church* herself cannot be altogether excused from the *idolatry* of her *ignorant communicants*, seeing she puts unnecessary scandals in ignorant persons’ way.” *Dodwell’s Answer to Six Queries*. P. 45.

If this be what is meant by calling the Church of Rome idolatrous for her Invocation of Saints, the Author agrees in the charge, *so limited*.

† Mountague, a Protestant Bishop, before referred to, condemning the Invocation of Saints, observes—

“ Indeed, I grant Christ is not wronged in his mediation. It is no impiety to say, *Sancta Maria, ora pro me: Sancta Petre, ora pro me*; and so no wrong done unto Christ Jesus, to use mediation of intercession unto him. As it is taught, I add, in their schools, by their doctors; resolved by that Oracle of Trent. But not as is practised in their use and custom, where simple men invoke saints, as they do God: go to their devotions to the blessed virgin, not only far more frequently than to Christ Jesus, but without any difference at all go to it downright, as to the authors and originals of all things they desire, having them in their power to bestow or not.” *Treatise upon the Invocation of Saints*. P. 118.

should actuate every Bishop and every Clergyman, to prevail with them to reform from their corruptions, and to come over to us. I have felt this desire, as it regards the question simply between the Roman Catholics and the Church of England; but that desire has been increased when I have observed that, among the seceders from the Roman Catholic Church, some have joined the standard of infidelity so unhappily prevailing in this country; but more particularly, if I am correctly informed, over the continent. I have, therefore, felt anxious that they might be preserved in good temper towards the true Apostolical Branch of the Church of Christ, established in these dominions. My desire thus to guard against all irritation has been further increased, when I have observed the prevailing schisms in this country, and the unchristian heats among the contending sectaries. I have, thought that an expression on the part of the Church of England of a desire of Union with the Church of Rome, *provided that that Church could be prevailed on to renounce her errors and corruptions*, would be the best means of restraining infidelity, and suppressing schism and false doctrine, against which we pray in our excellent Liturgy. If, however, in my desire to prevail with the Romanists to renounce their errors and delusions, I have so expressed myself as to occasion regret to the sincere and judicious friends of our Church, or to diminish, in the smallest degree, that just dread with which the Roman delusions should be viewed by every consistent Protestant, may the prayer, in the concluding part of the Preface to my “Reflections,” which now I again devoutly offer, be heard:

“ May the God of love, and of peace, who knows the secrets of all hearts, pity and pardon the writer, if

he have fallen into errors ; and may divine favour attend and assist his Christian purpose !”

Your Lordship, in a Letter which appeared in the Morning Post of the 29th of April, addressed to Dr. Phillimore, and which has since been printed with other Letters in the form of a Pamphlet, is pleased to observe, that I shall “ hereafter find sufficient employment in answering the animadversions of the *Eclectic Review*.”

A Writer in that Review for April, 1819, very strongly censures me for asserting (*stoutly* asserting according to the Reviewer) that “ the Council of Trent insists not on the necessity of Invoking the Saints, but only teaches that it is *good and useful* they should be invoked ;” and he infers that this assertion is inconsistent with that part of the 25th Session of the Council of Trent, to which it refers.

According to the English Translation of that part of the Session, as it is given by the Writer, it is decreed that the Bishops and Pastors do teach “ that the saints who reign together with Christ, offer their prayers to God for men—that *it is good and useful* suppliantly to invoke them, and to fly for refuge and assistance to their prayers, on account of the blessings obtained of God by his Son Jesus Christ, our Lord, and only Redeemer and Saviour ; but that those persons think *impiously*, who deny that the saints enjoying eternal felicity in heaven ought to be invoked, or who assert either that they do not pray for men, or that invoking them to pray for each of us in particular, is idolatry, or contrary to the Word of God, or opposed to the honour of Jesus Christ, the only Mediator of God and man, or that it is foolish to supplicate either vocally or mentally those who reign in heaven.

They are also to teach, that the holy bodies of the holy martyrs and of others living with Christ, which bodies are the living members of Christ, and the temple of the Holy Ghost, and which bodies shall be raised by him to eternal life, and glorified, are to be venerated by the faithful, through the means of which bodies many benefits are bestowed by God upon men ; so that *they who affirm* that veneration and honour are not due to the relics of the saints, or that these and other sacred memorials are honoured by the faithful to no purpose, and that the memories of the saints for the purpose of obtaining their succour ought not to be celebrated, are to be utterly condemned as the Church has formerly condemned, and does now condemn them—
IF ANY ONE SHALL TEACH OR THINK CONTRARY TO THESE ORDINANCES, LET HIM BE ACCURSED."

" We suppose," observes the Reviewer, " that Mr. Wix will not be likely to contend, that a doctrine which the Church of Rome so solemnly curses a man for gainsaying is inculcated by that Church as simply '*good and useful*,' but not as necessary or essential to salvation."

Now it is worthy of remark, that the anathema " if any one shall teach or think contrary, &c." which is, in the passage just quoted, represented, in inverted commas, as there closing the passage, does not occur in that part of the passage in the original.

The Decree, in the original, after having stated the doctrine of the Church of Rome respecting the Intercession and Invocation of Saints, the Honour of Relics, the lawful Use of Images, &c., condemns seven assertions, namely, *That the saints of heaven ought not to be invoked. That they do not pray for men. That it is idolatry to invoke them to pray for us.*

That it is repugnant to the Word of God, contrary to the honour of CHRIST, and a foolishness to pray unto them, either with heart or voice. That the bodies of saints, for whose sake God doth give us many benefits, ought not to be venerated. That their relics and sepultures ought not to be honoured. And that it is in vain to make mention of them, to obtain assistance.

The same Session then immediately proceeds to state what is to be taught concerning the Images of Christ, of the Virgin, and of the Saints, and cautions against a belief *that there is any divinity or virtue in them why they should be worshipped, or that any thing is to be sought for from them, or that confidence is to be placed in them, as the Gentiles formerly did, who placed their hope in idols ; but, because the honour which is paid to them is referred to the Prototype which they represent : so that, by the Images which they kiss and before which they bow, they adore Christ and venerate the saints, of whom they bear the likeness.* Then, and not before, the anathema occurs ; “ If any one shall teach contrary to these ordinances, let him be accursed.” This will be seen from that part of the Decree which immediately relates to the subject, and which, in its original connection and language, I subjoin in a note *.

* “ Mandat sancta Synodus omnibus Episcopis, et cæteris docendi munus, curàmque sustinentibus, ut juxta Catholicæ, et Apostolicæ Ecclesiæ usum primævis Christianæ religionis tēporibus receptum, sanctorumque patrum consensionem, et sacrorum conciliorum decreta, in primis de sanctorum Intercessione, invocatione, reliquiarum honore et legitimo imaginum usu, fideles diligenter instruant, *docentes eos, Sanctos, unā cum Christo regnantes*, orationes suas pro hominibus Deo offerre ; bonum, atque utile esse suppliciter eos invocare ; et ob beneficia

It will appear, from an attentive perusal of this Decree, that the anathema does not apply to those who

impetranda a Deo per filium ejus Jesum Christum Dominum nostrum, qui solus noster Redemptor et Salvator est, ad eorum orationes, opem auxiliumque confugere: illos vero qui negant sanctos, æternâ felicitate in cœlo fruenter, invocandos esse; aut qui asserunt, vel illos pro hominibus non orare; vel eorum, ut pro nobis etiam singulis orent, invocationem esse idololatriam; vel pugnare cum Verbo Dei, adversarique honori unius mediatoris Dei, et hominum Jesu Christi; vel stultum esse, in cœlo regnantibus voce, vel mente supplicare; impie sentire. Sanctorum quoque martyrum, et aliorum cum Christo viventium sancta corpora, quæ viva membra fuerunt Christi, et templum spiritus sancti, ab ipso ad æternam vitam suscitanda et glorificanda à fidelibus veneranda esse; per quæ multa beneficia a Deo hominibus præstantur; ita ut affirmantes, sanctorum reliquiis venerationem atque honorem non deberi; vel eas, aliâque sacra monumenta à fidelibus inutiliter honorari; atque eorum opis impetrandæ causa sanctorum *memorias frustra frequenturi*; omnino damnandos esse, prout jam pridem eos damnavit, et nunc etiam damnat ecclesia. Imagines porro Christi, Dei paræ virginis, et aliorum sanctorum, in templis præsertim habendas, et retinendas, eisque debitum honorem, et venerationem impertiendam, non quòd credatur inesse aliqua in iis divinitas, vel virtus, propter quam sint colendæ; vel quòd ab eis sit aliquid petendum, vel quòd fiducia in imaginibus sit figenda; veluti olim fiebant a Gentibus, quæ in idolis spem suam collocabant; sed quoniam honos, qui eis exhibetur, refertur ad prototypa, quæ illæ representant, ita ut per imagines, quas osculamur, et coram quibus caput aperimus, et procumbimus, Christum adoremus, et sanctos, quorum illa similitudinem gerunt, veneremur. Id quod conciliorum, præsertim verò secundæ Nicenæ Synodi decretis contra imaginum oppugnatores est sancitum.

“Illud verò diligenter doceant episcopi, per historias mysterium nostræ redemptionis, picturis, vel aliis similitudinibus expressas, erudiri, et confirmari populum in articulis fidei commemorandis, et assidue recolendis: tum vero ex omnibus sacris imaginibus magnum fructum percipi; non solum quia admonetur populus

quietly abstain from a practice which the Church of Rome has pronounced to be *good and useful*. It applies to those who *deny* that the saints enjoying eternal felicity in heaven, ought to be invoked; or who assert either that they do *not* pray for men, or that invoking them to pray for each of us in particular is *idolatry*, &c., who, respecting images shall teach, contrary to the doctrine of the Church, that there is any divinity or virtue in them why they should be worshipped, or that any thing is to be sought for from them, or that confidence is to be placed in them, as the Gentiles formerly did, who placed their hope in idols, &c.

What now shall we think of the judgment or of the integrity of a writer, who misplaces the quotation of an anathema; who represents it in inverted commas, as appearing where it does not appear in the original, and who then infers the sense of the decree to be, that Invocation of Saints is “necessary or essential to salvation;” which the decree has pronounced to be “good and useful.” The utmost that can be made of the anathema; as it regards the subject of the Invocation of Saints, is, Let him be anathema, who **TEACHES** *contrary to the decree of the Church*, that it is *good and useful to invoke the saints*; who proceeds to the intemperate and uncharitable censure of what was so

beneficiorum, et munerum, quæ a Christo sibi collata sunt, sed etiam quia Dei per sanctos miracula, et salutaria exempla oculis fidelium subjiciuntur: ut pro iis Deo gratias agant, ad sanctorumque imitationem vitam, moresque suos componant, excitenturque ad orandum, ac diligendum Deum, et ad pietatem colendam. *Si quis autem his decretis contraria docuerit, aut senserit; anathema sit.*”

pronounced to be *good and useful*, to a wanton denial of it; to charging it with *idolatry*, &c.

Far, however, is it from my desire to attempt to justify the introduction of the anathema, and very far is it from my intention to offer an apology for the Invocation of Saints, or for any dangerous ambiguity in the phraseology of the Council. Let it be remembered, that my object in stating what I conceived to be the meaning of the Council of Trent, respecting the doctrine, and which I stated in the very words of the Council, was to illustrate my hope as to the facility with which the Roman Catholics might abandon many of their errors, by showing how I thought they might, according to the spirit of their Church, abandon this particular error of invoking saints. The following is an English translation of the passage from the French author, which I gave in confirmation of my own opinion, and not as the Reviewer unfairly infers, as the medium through which I read or adverted to the Council of Trent.

“ That the saints do intercede for us with God, is a dogma of Revelation, positively taught by the Council of Trent, supposed in the second Council of Nice, founded on antiquity, and the New Testament, proved by the unanimous teaching of the fathers, especially by the uniformity of the orthodox, or schismatic Liturgies, of the fifth age. The greater part of Protestants, the Lutherans especially, have no difficulty in admitting it*. But faith does not oblige us to believe, that we

* L'Apologie de la Confession d'Ausbourg dit, “ Nous accordons que les Saints prient dans le ciel pour L'Eglise en général.” La Confession Saxon dit: “ Il, n'est pas douteux, que les Saints ne prient pour l'Eglise; et cependant il ne s'en

must necessarily invoke the saints. The Council of Trent does not teach us that it is necessary, but simply that it is good and useful to invoke them. It does not give us a general precept to run to their prayers ; it limits itself in inculcating upon us the utility. He who acknowledging it in theory, should abstain to profit from it, would be a badly advised man, and not an heretic *. *Discussion Amicale*, Tom. II. P. 273.

The whole of the Article in the Review which has occasioned these remarks is written in a temper which, it is hoped, the Reviewer will, at some time or other, be sorry for having indulged. There is such a wanton disregard and wilful perversion of what was evidently intended in my "Reflections," so uncandid a disposition to represent me as defending certain delusions of the Roman Church, which I had expressly ranked as among the fundamental errors of

suit pas qu'il faille les invoquer." La Confession de Wittenberg dit : " De même que les Anges sollicitent pour nous, de même les Saints prient dans le Ciel pour l'Eglise." *Chemnitius examen du Concile de Trente*. P. 3.

* Agreeably to the opinion here expressed concerning the meaning of the Decree, that it is *good and useful* to invoke the saints ; *Collet*, a Catholic Divine, of much esteem among the Roman Catholics, in § 2. (de Invocatione et Intercessione Sanctorum) of his Appendix to his Treatise de Incarnatione, tom. 1. after citing the words of the Council, Session 25. " Mandat. S. Synodus," &c. to " impie sentire"... " damnat ecclesia," observes, " Quâ in definitione concilii in hoc uno hæret fides, *bonum atque utile esse sanctos invocare* : non autem additur necessarium omninò esse ad salutem illos invocare ; quanquam salutis suæ negligens haberetur, qui vel ex incuriâ, et multo magis ex contemptu, tam pium ac laudabilem usum non observaret." P. 614.

that Church *, particularly the doctrine of Transubstantiation, the Invocation of Saints, and the adoption

* The Writer in the Eclectic Review states, " Mr. Wix occupies twelve pages (14 to 26) in attempting to smooth and soften the foul error of TRANSUBSTANTIATION."-- Review for May, 1819. Again, he writes, " Is it possible that Mr. Wix can expect us to believe that he really assents to articles in which the following declarations occur, ' *Transubstantiation* cannot be proved by Holy Writ, but is repugnant to the plain words of Scripture, overthroweth the nature of a sacrament, and has given occasion to many superstitions'." *Review for April*, 1819.

I manifested an anxiety to soften the irritating language which is often unnecessarily adopted against the Roman errors, and which, I am of opinion, has tended to confirm the Romanists in their delusions ; but in regard to Transubstantiation, I wrote as a Member of the Church of England.

" Among the errors which are commonly objected against the Church of Rome, are Transubstantiation and the Invocation of Angels and departed Saints. These are the grand sources of many other errors, as the Church of England considers them, of the Romish Church." *Reflections*, p. 14.

The Writer in the Eclectic Review, for May, 1819, observes, " Mr. Wix, in defending the Intercession of the Virgin," &c. Again, " So much for Mr. Wix's defence of invoking the saints," &c. *Review for April*, 1819.

In my *Reflections*, I wrote, " Another practice of the Church of Rome, considered as fundamentally erroneous by the Church of England, is, her addressing prayers to angels and departed saints." Page 26. Again, " It cannot be ascertained by reference to ancient ecclesiastical history, that the Invocation of the blessed Virgin Mary was ever practised in the primitive ages." P. 27.

The Writer in the Eclectic Review charges Mr. Wix with offering an " Apology for prayers in an unknown tongue." *Review for June*, 1819.

I said, indeed, " With respect to the church service being in

of language not commonly understood for the Church service ; such needless, and such uncharitable insinuations against me, and such unchristian reference of “ the main plan and execution of my work ” to an “ absence of all spiritual perception upon some of the simplest and most elementary truths,” (*Review for May, 1819*),

a language not understood by the common people, which custom has sometimes been stated to be grounded on a wish to preserve the people in ignorance, a more kind explanation might have been found in the affection of the Roman Catholics for the Latin language, as being, *in a certain degree*, a Catholic language.” P. 32.

In my anxious hope, however, that the effect of a Council, charitably conducted, might prevail with the Romanists to abandon many of their errors, I wrote—

“ Let none suppose that the Writer is insensible of the errors or improprieties of the Church of Rome ; among which may be reckoned, in addition to those already mentioned, the impropriety of the church service being in a language not understood by the common people.” P. 31. And, “ In the Council which it is proposed should be called, this custom of the church service being in a language not understood by the common people, might be considered, and be consequently abandoned.” P. 34.

To this I subjoined the following note—

“ The Rev. Chetwode Eustace, a Roman Catholic Clergyman, in the 2d Edition of his *Classical Tour through Italy*, Vol. I. P. 374, alluding to a desired revival of some primitive discipline, observes,

“ ‘ If in reviving this part of primitive discipline, he,’ [the Roman Pontiff] ‘ would also exercise the power which the Council of Trent has entrusted to him, and would admit, as I have hinted above, the laity to the cup (so solemn and impressive a part of the sacred rite) and if, at the same time, he would communicate to every nation, the comfort of singing the praises of God in their own language, he would render to the Church of Christ a most important and ever memorable service.’ ”

that, while I pity the Author, I must decline further controversy with one who is unhappily deficient in every qualification with which controversy can be conducted to any good effect. Surely, my Lord, if you have read through this review of my work, you cannot feel comfortable, when you reflect that, in your eighth Letter to Dr. Phillimore, you wrote, in a temper which *you* also ought not to have indulged.

“He,” [Mr. Wix,] “will hereafter find sufficient employment in answering the Animadversions of the ECLECTIC REVIEW, for the present month.”

The Writer of this Review, with a sneer which is well understood, after having calumniated many respectable authorities, produced by me, in illustration of my plan of a Council, alludes to the learned Henry Dodwell, as *Doctor Dodwell*, and as being of the priesthood;—of being *himself* “one of this *exalted fraternity*,” or of a “*worldly minded priesthood*,” as he a little further on writes, (*Review for May, 1819*). The fact is, that Henry Dodwell was not a Doctor, nor did that learned man ever enter into holy orders.

It is to a Writer so inaccurate, and *so disposed*, that your Lordship is pleased to refer me, as the controvertor of my “*Reflections*,” concerning the Expediency of a Council.

However your Lordship, in your zeal against the Roman Catholics, may think it right to represent the Invocation of saints, I will hope that you are now satisfied of your mistake in charging me with misconceiving or mistaking the doctrines of my own Church, because I could not, with your Lordship, call the practice, *as it is stated by the Roman Church*, idolatrous: and, if you feel this, I have a security that my

character will be protected from the injury which it may sustain among some persons, if your insinuations against me remain unrecalled.

It is in the power of any person of less authority, and of less ability than your Lordship, to give a partial extract from an Author, and then to draw a conclusion very different from that which the Author intended, or which his writings will warrant. I very deeply regret to have occasion again to complain that this has been done by your Lordship.

“ In the same Preface * (p. 26),” your Lordship in the 6th Letter to Dr. Phillimore writes,

“ Mr. Wix says the Church of England professes *the same faith* with the Church of Rome, in all the *essential doctrines* of Christianity.”

In my anxious desire, on the Renunciation of Error, to promote that Union between Christians, which I consider as of the essence of Christianity †, I had pre-

* To guard against mistake, the Author again observes, that the Bishop means in the *Address* to the Roman Catholics, where the words occur, and not in the *Preface*.

† “ Religious animosity must be a painful sentiment to every well formed heart. To contribute to soften it, or to destroy it, must be a charitable office. Christians of all denominations, instead of quarrelling with each other, should unite their endeavours against the infamous philosophism of the times. Let them render their common citadel of the Gospel impregnable, and then, as to their distinctive tenets, let them be viewed with candour, and discussed with charity. Let the obstacles arising from the heart, passion, interest, selfishness, be removed, and truth must be the gainer.

“ Yet, let not indifference be mistaken for charity. If there be *one God, one Faith, one Baptism*, (Eph. iv. 5.) truth must be *one*. From indifference to doubt, from doubt to disbelief, the

viously observed, that " Union was not, indeed, nor ought to be desired, between the true Apostolical Church, and those who renounce Apostolical Discipline; between the believers in the only atonement of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the professors of his holy sacraments; and those who deny the atonement and despise the sacraments *."

Agreeably to this principle, I proceeded to observe, " Much of the supposed difficulty of an attempt to restore an Union of Christians, has arisen from a feeling that such Union is, as it indeed is, impracticable between the Roman Catholics and the Protestants generally. A very able work has lately been translated into French, and sent into this country, under the title of, ' *ENTRETIENS Philosophiques, sur LA REUNION des differentes Communions Chrétiennes. Par Feu, M. le Baron DE STARCK.*' "

" This work justly states the impossibility of an Union of the Catholic Church with the great body of Protestants. The name of Protestant is, unhappily, over the Continent, too commonly, but another name for a Free Thinker, who despises the constitution of the Church of Christ, and renounces the Christian faith. No sound Catholic, whether of the Church of Rome, or of the Church of England, can unite with Protestants, while they refuse to be under the discipline of the Church, or to bow to its faith. But the case is not so with the Church of England. She pro-

descent is almost imperceptible. Philosophism has not a greater friend than indifference. It undermines all religion most effectually.—Introduction to Bossuet's *Exposition abridged*. P. 4.

* Vide, *Address to the Roman Catholics*, prefixed to " *Reflections*." P. 10. second Edit.

fesses the same faith with the Church of Rome, in all *the essential doctrines of Christianity*; and she believes, consistently with the constitution of the Church of Rome, that there is no Church without a Bishop. She, therefore, and the Church of Rome, may, it is believed, and anxiously hoped, meet together in Christian love"—in *Christian love*—for what?—to forward *the renunciation of error, and the establishment of truth*, as was expressed in various parts of my work; that the Church of Rome, when so purified, and so united with the Church of England, might become "the happy means of drawing multitudes into the same common fold of Jesus Christ *."

Yet your Lordship, overlooking all this, and adding that the Church of Rome "professes to believe in, *Transubstantiation, Purgatory, the Invocation of Saints, and the Worship of the Host*, and considers them (together with the *Supremacy of the Pope*,) as doctrines and usages *essential* to Christianity," concludes, "Till Mr. Wix ceases to consider the faith of the two Churches to be *essentially the same*, which Pope Pius's Creed, and the Articles of the Church of England, declare to be essentially different, he will never see the spiritual, moral, and political obstacles, which oppose his project of union."

But there is, with submission to your Lordship, a great difference between the assertion made by me, on the previous statement how the Churches of England and of Rome believed in the prominent doctrines of Christianity; that the Church of England professes *the same faith* with the Church of Rome, in all *the essential doctrines* of Christianity; and that adopted by

* Page 25, of *Address to the Roman Catholics*.

your Lordship, and imputed to me, that the faith of the two Churches is *essentially the same*. I never did assert the faith of the two Churches to be *essentially the same*. Having previously admitted, p. 11, that “the Church was infallible in her maintenance of all the true and prominent doctrines of Christianity, such as the belief of a God, of the divinity of Christ and his atonement,” which doctrines “were derived from the Bible,” I consistently observed, that the Church of England professes the same faith with the Church of Rome, both being branches of the Church of Christ, “in all the essential doctrines of Christianity;” and your Lordship’s conclusion, that I believe the faith of the two Churches to be *essentially the same*, is not warranted by my language, unless indeed your Lordship should, for the sake of argument, assume, which it is not possible, I think, you should assume, that *Transubstantiation, Purgatory, the Invocation of Saints, and the Worship of the Host, together with the Supremacy of the Pope*, which are doctrines and usages of the Roman Church, are doctrines and usages *essential to Christianity*. Exclude these last mentioned doctrines, which no Protestant Clergyman can allow to be *essential doctrines of Christianity*; and, in an Address to the Roman Catholics, prefixed to Reflections inviting consideration whether any thing could be done towards the renunciation of error, as the means of accommodating religious differences, it may be asserted, that the Church of England professes the same faith with the Church of Rome in all the *essential doctrines of Christianity*.

Two Churches may agree in the essential doctrines of Christianity, while one of the Churches may have unscriptural additions, which the other has not. Both

Churches may, therefore, be said to profess the same faith in all the essential doctrines of Christianity; but it could not be asserted that the faith of the two Churches was *essentially the same*. That is very different, and was not asserted by me; yet does your Lordship draw your conclusion as though I had asserted it; "Till Mr. Wix ceases to consider the faith of the two Churches to be *essentially the same*," &c.

"A great part of the Roman Catholic faith," says Archbishop Tillotson, "is the same with ours, as, namely, the articles of the Apostles' Creed, *as explained by the four first general councils*. And these make up *our whole faith*, so far as concerns matters of mere and simple belief, that are of absolute necessity to salvation. . . . And thus far, our faith and theirs of the Roman Church are undoubtedly of equal authority, that is, as ancient as Christianity itself. . . . And as for the negative articles of the Protestant religion, in opposition to the errors and corruptions of the Romish faith, these are by accident become a part of our faith and religion, occasioned by their errors. . . . When the additions, which the Church of Rome hath made to the ancient Christian faith, and their innovations in practice, are pared off, that which remains of their religion *is ours*." *Serm. 27.*

"The united Church has renounced the *errors* of popery, *but no more*; it has steadily observed the mean between superstition on the one hand, and fanaticism or philosophism on the other; and thus it has departed much less from the Church of Rome than any other Protestant communion existing in these countries. We, as well as the Romanists, belong to an Athanasian Episcopal Church; we can boast of an uninterrupted apostolical succession; we condemn heresy and schism as

in themselves offences; and we recognize the first four councils, *as explanatory of the essential articles of belief.*" Phelan on the Bible Society, p. 21.

I now proceed to notice a few passages of your Lordship's Letter to Lord Kenyon. It will not be necessary to dwell much on these, after the remarks which I have already had the pain to make on parts of your Lordship's Preface, and of the Letters addressed to Dr. Phillimore. Many of the passages, it may be observed, of the Letter to Lord Kenyon, as also of the Letters to Dr. Phillimore, are truths unnecessarily introduced, and, I think, too, unkindly; so far as they tend to convey an idea that I am insensible of the corruptions of the Roman Church.

At page 2, of your Lordship's Letter, you state that one of your objects, is "to show that the project of Union with the *unreformed Church of Rome*, is inexpedient, impracticable, unprotestant, and (as far as it concerns the dissenters from our Church) uncharitable," &c.

I have already written enough in reply to the insinuation of projecting an Union with the *unreformed Church of Rome*; an insinuation, I am sorry to observe, as uncandid as it is unmerited.

At page 9, of the Letter to Lord Kenyon, is the following passage—

"To any one conversant in the history of Councils, and of projects of Union, the measure proposed in the pamphlet, which is the subject of this Letter, will be seen at once to be utterly impracticable, *without many renunciations of doctrines and usages*, on the part of that Church, with which the *Reflections* recommend that the Church of England should hold a Council."

I have, my Lord, frequently, in those "*Reflec-*

tions," insisted that the object of the Council was to prepare the way for *many renunciations* of doctrines and of usages on the part of the Roman Church; and *without which* Union was not desired, nor recommended. This is a fact which will be readily admitted by every consistent Protestant, *without his being conversant in the history of Councils, and of projects of Union.*

At page 10, it is remarked, "The purpose of Mr. Wix's *Reflections* is to moderate between *Protestantism* and *Popery*; in doing which he considers the Roman Catholics as an injured party, and the advocates of the Church of England against popery, as injurious calumniators."

This is very incautiously asserted. They are not the advocates of the Church of England against *popery* who are represented, in any part of the "*Reflections*," as injurious calumniators; but those who misconstrue some of the indifferent customs of popery into superstition or idolatry. This, after having stated as a fundamentally erroneous practice of the Church of Rome, her addressing prayers to angels and departed saints, was particularly instanced in the following passage:—

"There are other practices of the Church of Rome, which, however erroneous they are supposed to be, have been greatly misrepresented, and referred to principles which the Roman Catholic himself does not acknowledge. Thus, the praying *before* a crucifix has been uncandidly represented as idolatrously praying *to* a crucifix. The frequent signing with the sign of the cross, the use of consecrated water, the bowing at the altar, all these have been denominated superstitious, and sometimes worse; whereas they are, in reality, ceremonies harmless in themselves, or which

may be either beneficial, or otherwise, as they are used properly, or as they are abused." *Reflections*, P. 27.

At page 12, it is remarked, "The Bishop," [Taylor,] "intended in the passage which Mr. Wix has quoted, (p. 32,) no palliation of error, but merely a plea for *toleration* and *endurance*."

And why observe thus, my Lord? Did I assert, or intimate, that good Bishop Taylor intended to palliate Romish error? I merely asserted what the learned Bishop himself asserted, as to the Roman Catholics maintaining the true foundation of Christian faith. This *he* made the ground of his argument—certainly *not* to palliate error—but *why* the Roman Catholics should be tolerated. As your Lordship observes, in the Preface to the first part of his *Dissuasive from Popery*, Bishop Taylor justly remarks—

"It is certain that the Roman religion, as it stands in distinction from us, is a body of strange propositions, having but little relish of true, primitive, and pure Christianity."

At p. 14, your Lordship writes, "In the Preface to the first part of the *Dissuasive* [from Popery] Bishop Taylor says, 'We know idolatry is a damnable sin, and we also know, that the Roman Church, with all the artifices she could use, can never justify herself, or acquit *the common practices of idolatry*.'"

Here is an incorrect quotation. The words of Bishop Taylor are, "We know idolatry is a damnable sin, and we all know that the Roman Church, with all the artifices she could use, never can justify herself, or acquit the common practices *from* idolatry." We are agreed, my Lord, that idolatry is a damnable sin; and we know that the Roman Church can never justify

herself in laying, however unintentionally, stumbling-blocks to idolatry; nor can she, having laid the stumbling-blocks, acquit the common practices of her ignorant and undesignedly deluded people *from idolatry*. But although there is good authority for writing that you acquit either *of* or *from* any charge, still your Lordship's quotation is incorrect; and, as you produce the passage, unconnectedly, you convey to ordinary readers an idea that those practices, are practices of idolatry necessarily attaching to the doctrines of the Church of Rome. As Bishop Taylor constructs the passage, he charges the Roman Church, and justly charges her, with inability to acquit the common practices *from* idolatry—that is—those practices, into which the unguarded members of the Church of Rome have commonly fallen, and into which all her members are *in peril of falling* from the stumbling-blocks which are cast in their way, but which do not necessarily betray to practices of idolatry, into which we may charitably hope that many of her pious members, *who have been guided by her Councils and Doctrines*, have never fallen.

Bishop Taylor, in the context of the passage referred to, condemns the “superstition,” not the *idolatry* of the guides of the Roman Church. “Is it not,” he observes, “great reason we should contend for that faith which forbids all worship of images, and oppose the *superstition* of such guides who do teach their people to give them veneration,” &c *. In the Second Part of his Dissuasive from Popery, he observes, “It is also

* Bishop Taylor's Dissuasive from Popery. *Preface to Reader.*

very *scandalous* to Christians, that is, it makes many, and endangers more to fall into the direct sin of idolatry *," or, as it is in the Table of Contents, "It is a *scandal*, and *makes way* for heathen idolatry."

The Church of Rome, it may be repeated is, however, to be condemned for any doctrines or usages, though not absolutely idolatrous, that may undesignedly *tend* to idolatrous practices; and is unable to justify herself, or acquit the common practices *from* idolatry, into which her unreflecting or less informed members have, it is to be feared, unhappily fallen.

At p. 15, we read; "If the Church of Rome be idolatrous, there can be neither calumny nor absurdity in calling her antichristian, or the antichristian power. Nothing can be more antichristian than idolatry."

In this passage, there is a *petitio principii* not justifiable, and a kind of logic not correct. "If," it is said, "the Church of Rome be idolatrous, there can be neither calumny nor absurdity in calling her antichristian, or the antichristian power," and it is immediately asserted: *nothing can be more antichristian than idolatry*. Certainly nothing can be more so. But still the antichristianity, as is stated by your Lordship, rests on the fact that the Church of Rome is idolatrous, which, I humbly conceive, without offering any opinion of my own on the subject, the arguments which you proceed to offer by implication, do not satisfactorily prove her to be. And it does not seem consistent with fact, nor with the mild spirit of Christianity, to call that Church "THE ANTICHRISTIAN POWER," which professes the Apostles' Creed, the

* Second Part of Dissuasive from Popery. Book II. Sect. 6. P. 549. Fol. Edit.

Nicene Creed, and the Athanasian Creed, even though she has, in addition, the articles contained in Pope Pius's Creed, of which I disapprove as much as any Protestant ought. He is antichrist who denieth the Father and the Son *; but whatever may be inferred to the contrary, the Church of Rome, as well as the Church of England, believes in *God the Father Almighty, and in Jesus Christ, his only Son, our Lord.*

Your Lordship may reply by calling this strange reasoning, "As if every day's experience did not afford us proof that it is possible to profess a confidence in God and Christ, and yet in works to deny it." (*Letter VI. to Dr. Phillimore.*)—Certainly a man may in works deny his confidence in God and Christ; but he does not, therefore, necessarily cease to believe in God and Christ: and whoever believes in God and Christ, cannot, I conceive, be considered as of a Church properly denominated, "THE ANTICHRISTIAN POWER."

At p. 19, it is observed: "A great source of Roman Catholic idolatry and superstition has arisen from their doctrine of *Transubstantiation*, which Mr. Wix thinks is 'in some measure warranted by the language of Scripture, and of our Church Catechism.'" The passage in my Reflections to which this refers is as follows.

"Who shall say the precise point at which our faith should stop, in our humble adorations at the altar? Here each individual, according to the spirit of our tolerant Church, must be left to judge for himself; and the Roman Catholic seems, in some degree, warranted in the language with which he adverts to

* 1 John ii. 22.

the consecrated elements, by the words of our Saviour, 'Take eat, this is my body *;' by the words of St. Paul, 'The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ; the bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ †?' and by the answer in the Church of England Catechism, to the question relating to the Sacrament; 'What is the inward part or thing signified?' which answer is, 'The body and blood of Christ, which are *verily* and *indeed* taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper.' On this, as on various other occasions of divine mystery, it becomes us devoutly to pray with the Father in the Gospel, who would benefit from a belief in the almighty power of Jesus; 'Lord I believe; help thou mine unbelief ‡; and having offered up this prayer, to adopt the language of Scripture, and, as nearly as we can ascertain it, the language of the earliest Christian professors, humbly aspiring after that belief which the language was intended to command, judging, at the same time, with all meekness and charity, of the opinions of our brethren of like weakness with ourselves, and never allowing different shades of opinion on matters above our comprehension, to lead to schism in the Church of Christ ||." P. 15, &c. of Reflections.

* Mark xiv. 22.

† 1 Cor. x. 16.

‡ Mark ix. 24.

|| In illustration of my meaning in the above passage, I beg leave to transcribe part of the 33d section of a Lecture on the 28th Article of our Church, which treats on Transubstantiation, by John Hey, D.D. the late much and deservedly respected Norrisian Professor of Divinity in the University of Cambridge.

"In regard to *application*, I will only observe, that in this article, there seems great room for *mutual concessions*.

Your Lordship, in the passage quoted from your Letter, represents me, in inverted commas, as *thinking* the doctrine of Transubstantiation "*in some measure warranted by the language of Scripture and of our Church Catechism.*" The passage in my *Reflections* is very different, namely, that "the Roman Catholic seems in some degree warranted *in the language with which he adverts to the consecrated elements*, by the words of our Saviour," &c. (2d Edit.) In the 1st Edition the passage was, "the Roman Catholic seems, in some degree, warranted in the language with which he adverts to the real presence of Christ in the sacrament." Either passage is far from asserting, as your Lordship misrepresents, that I "think Transubstantiation in some measure warranted by the language of Scripture." You have, my Lord, yourself observed, in your Postscript *in Answer to Dr. Milner's Postscript*, that, "the *real presence* of Christ is not Transubstantiation. The real presence of Christ is *universal, unchangeable, and always subsisting.*"

The whole passage in my "Reflections" was intended to submit the propriety of caution in judging of

"What can seem more desperate at first, than Dupin's insisting on its being still professed, 'that the bread and wine are *really* changed into the body and blood of Christ!' Yet, if that had been said by a Protestant, and perhaps put in a shape a little different, we should have made no objection to it. Might not a Protestant Preacher, addressing that part of his congregation who would attend the communion, and exhorting them to pay due reverence to the sacred elements, say, that he who should eat them *now* would eat only simple *bread and wine*; but that he who received them properly after consecration, would 'would verily and indeed *,' receive 'the body and blood of Christ?'"

* *Catechism of the Church of England.*

our Roman brethren's faith, by allowing them the same latitude in the language used by them respecting the Sacrament, as the members of the Church of England claim to themselves from their language; but, far from any justification or warranty of the doctrine of Transubstantiation being conveyed or intended, it was, at p. 26 of my "Reflections," expressly ranked among those doctrines which are by the Church of England considered to be *fundamentally erroneous*. In a note at p. 20, I observed, "May we not indulge a reasonable hope, that a dispassionate conference with Roman Catholics, might, *even on this fundamental error of Transubstantiation*, lead to mutual concession and unity of sentiment, so far, at least, as is necessary to the purpose desired, between them and other members of the visible Church?" The Editor of the Anti-jacobin Review, in his critique of the first Edition of my "Reflections," fell into the same mistake as to my meaning with your Lordship: and he had the candour to acknowledge his mistake when it was pointed out.

At p. 32 of "Reflections," I had observed: "With respect to the Church Service being in a language not understood by the common people, which custom has sometimes been stated to be grounded on a wish to preserve the people in ignorance, a more kind explanation might have been found in the affection of the Roman Catholics for the Latin language, as being, *in a certain degree*, a Catholic language." This your Lordship unguardedly misinterprets into "a palliation for the use of the Latin language in the Church Service *," though I had expressly ranked it "among the errors or improprieties of the Church of Rome †," and

* Page 19 of Letter to Lord Kenyon.

† Page 31 of *Reflections*.

had gladly expressed an expectation that in the Council which it was proposed should be called, it "might be considered, and be consequently *abandoned*," (p. 34.)—But, your Lordship observes, that "the term *Catholic* is as inapplicable to the Roman language, as to the Roman Church," (p. 20:) 'This observation might be correct if I had asserted, *without qualification*, that it was a *Catholic* language: I merely observed, with a view to correct the uncharitable custom of referring its adoption to a wish to preserve the people in ignorance, that it was, "in a certain degree," a Catholic language, and so it is (being more universally understood, I believe, all over the world than any other particular language is) to an extent which will warrant the use that I have made of the remark.—Though this cannot, indeed, justify the use of it in the Church Service, while it is not generally understood among all classes of people, still it endears its use to a considerable portion of the Roman Catholics, and is a more Christian ground of considering the custom, I think, than that of irritatingly referring it to a desire of preserving the people in ignorance.

You are not quite correct, my Lord, when at p. 20, alluding to the use of Latin Prayers in the Church Service, you observe,

"Mr. Wix says, 'These are practices which were bitterly inveighed against during the heat of the Reformation, when the members of the Church of Rome, and the Protestants, had mutually irritated each other, and were neither in a temper to come to any harmonious conclusion.'"

This passage at p. 28 of my "Reflections," occurs immediately after the following passage before recited.

"There are other practices of the Church of Rome, which, however erroneous they are supposed to be,

have been greatly misrepresented, and referred to principles which the Roman Catholic himself does not acknowledge. Thus, the praying *before* a crucifix has been uncandidly represented as idolatrously praying to a crucifix. The frequent signing with the sign of the cross, the use of consecrated water, the bowing at the altar, all these have been denominated, superstitious, and sometimes worse; whereas, they are, in reality, ceremonies harmless in themselves, or which may be either beneficial, or otherwise, as they are used properly, or as they are abused."

"These, however," it follows, "were practices which were bitterly inveighed against during the heat of the Reformation," &c. When I offered this observation, which your Lordship applies to the *Latin service*, the Latin service had not been mentioned by me, in my "Reflections."

At page 24, your Lordship writes:—"Another objection to Mr. Wix's proposal is, that it is directly *contrary* to the principle of Archbishop Wake's Letter, which he recommends for adoption. Mr. Wix proposes *mutual* concessions. The Archbishop admits nothing like concession on our part."

Believe me, my Lord, the concessions that I had in contemplation, on the part of the Church of England*, should a Council be called, were not of so

* The learned Norrisian Professor, Dr. Hey, before quoted, treating on the 22d Article respecting the Invocation of Saints, observes, in the 21st section—

"If we say any thing in the way of *application*, it shall be concerning the *mutual concessions* which might be conceived to take place, supposing the contending parties were perfectly candid: indeed, from mutual concessions must of course arise *improvements*. I always wish, whilst I am engaged in contro-

weighty a nature but they would have fallen under that proposal of the Archbishop, in his Letter to Mr. Beauvoir, dated Feb. 24, 1718, on the subject of Union between the English and Gallican Churches, "to communicate in every thing we can with one another." And, as to a charitable allowance of some different shades of opinion on mysterious subjects, the Archbishop would have gone, at least, as far as I could desire, when he proposed, in the same Letter, that "would they purge out of their Offices what is contrary to ours, we might join in the Public Service with them, and yet leave one another in the free liberty of believing Transubstantiation or not, so long as we did not require any thing to be done by either in pursuance of that opinion."

At p. 25, your Lordship remarks, "And here we meet, *in limine*, with an insurmountable obstacle to the proposed Council. Who is to convene it? The Pope? as oecumenical Bishop of the Christian Church? Such a summons *we* cannot acknowledge. The Prince Regent? as head of the Church of England? That is the authority the Roman Catholics do not admit."

To this I shall reply by reciting the commencement of the 21st Article of the Church of England: "General Councils may not be gathered together *without* the commandment and will of princes. And when they *be* gathered together, &c." Plainly, therefore, according to the Article, they *may* be gathered together *with* the commandment and will of princes. The difficulty of assembling them may be great; and it may be inex-

versy, that some respectable adversary were present; in order that personal respect might prevent any thing illiberal from being thrown out."

pedient that they should be assembled at the present period ; but still the *principle* of the *proposal* is contemporaneous with the principle of the Article.

At p. 29 is the following passage : “ The old Puritans separated from our Church, because they thought that we retained *too much of Popery in our Services*. What would their descendants think ? what would many of our own most zealous Protestant friends think ? if, by Mr. Wix’s plan of *mutual* concessions, we were to re-admit any of the doctrines and usages, against which our pious and martyred Reformers protested ; and which, no doubt, the Roman Catholics in Council would most pertinaciously retain.”

By what right, my Lord, do you insinuate that, according to *my plan*, “ doctrines and usages against which our pious and martyred Reformers protested” might be re-admitted. My plan was to invite consideration as to the Expediency of a Council to consider whether means could be adopted to forward the renunciation of Roman delusions. I will pass over what, with grief, I consider a most uncandid insinuation, from so high a quarter ; and shall only remark that, if the Roman Catholics, in Council, would most pertinaciously retain those doctrines and usages which you prejudice that they would, then the Council could not accomplish its desirable object ; but it would not have been called improperly. It becomes us, in the spirit of our holy religion, to endeavour, by affectionate consultation, to dissuade from error, to perpetuate truth, and to promote Christian peace upon earth. That peace is not, in my opinion, most likely to be obtained by deferring to the opinions of the Puritans, or of those “ our most zealous Protestant friends,” who take part with the Puritans, and object to the

Church under the mistake that we retain *too much of Popery in our Services**; but it is by a generous warfare, conducted with Christian charity, against schism, and by zealously contending for the faith which was once delivered to the saints.

At p. 30, your Lordship writes; "Would it not be much more natural and charitable and Christian like, to devise some means, if possible, of recovering to the Church the various denominations of Dissenters in England and Ireland, and of the Kirk of Scotland? *Mutual concessions* might be more practicable with them, than with the Church of Rome, a very large portion of the Dissenters being what are called *orthodox* Dissenters, and none of them having to look higher for the origin of their dissent than the sixteenth century; and a very small portion of them differing from us in the essentials of their faith."

I will not enter into the comparative question, which would be the more natural, and charitable, and Christian like. I will only observe, for myself, that some years back I published a work, as your Lordship knows, entitled, "Scriptural Illustrations of the Thirty-Nine Articles of the Church of England, affectionately intended to

* Is the phrase of retaining "too much of Popery" quite justifiably introduced by the Bishop on this occasion?—Bishop Taylor, in the Preface to his *Apologie for authorized and set Forms of Liturgie*, observed,

"I cannot say but many of our prayers are also in the *Roman* Offices. But so they are also in Scripture; so also is the Lord's Prayer; and if they were not, yet the allegation is very inartificial, and the charge peevish and unreasonable, unless there were nothing good in the *Roman* books, or that it were unlawful to pray a good prayer, which they had once stamped with red letters."

promote Religious Peace and Unity ;” and I had previously published “ Reflections concerning Religious Divisions.” But your Lordship thinks that *mutual concessions might be more practicable with the various denominations of Dissenters than with the Church of Rome, a very large portion of the Dissenters being what are called orthodox Dissenters, and a very small portion of them differing from us in the essentials of their faith.* I have in my “ Reflections” already observed, “ Whatever may be the errors of the Church of Rome, they are not, in the view of the Writer, so alarming, nor should they be, in the view of any sound member of the Church of England, as the errors of the Socinians, the Anabaptists, the Quakers, and others, who reject Episcopal discipline, and depart widely from Apostolical faith. For the Church of Rome has the foundation of true faith, and the advantages of a discipline, modelled after Apostolical practice.” (p. 94.) As to conceding to what are called the orthodox Dissenters, allowing that they differ not from us in the essentials of their faith, it would be difficult to know in what respects we are to concede to them, unless in matters of discipline, and in that authority which your Lordship bears in the Christian congregation to call and send ministers into the Lord’s vineyard, which the Church of England acknowledges, but which the Dissenters renounce, and allow to be a ground of schism. Most desirable it would, indeed, be, if means could be devised to prevail with those Dissenters, who agree with us in doctrine, to agree with us, also, in discipline ; because, when once a visible ministry, acting under the authority of Christ, and his Apostles, and his Bishops, in succession, is disregarded, the door, we find, is opened to as many varieties of false doc-

trine as there are discordant opinions; and the world generally fails of that proof which Christ himself intended of the truth of his religion from the oneness of his disciples. But, I suspect, my Lord, that you and I have not similar ideas of *the importance of unity*, and of *the mischiefs of schism*. I am taught by the Church to pray against all false doctrine, heresy, and schism, as *positive evils*, while your Lordship conveys a direct censure upon my Proposal for considering the Expediency of a Council, as being actuated by "*the spectre of domestic schism*."—"But," your Lordship writes at p. 22, "Mr. Wix did not always view the Church of Rome, in the light, in which he appears to consider her in his Reflections. When he examines and illustrates the doctrines of his own Church, he 'nothing extenuates, nor sets aught down in malice.' But when he has *the spectre of domestic schism* in view, the enormities of schismatical and heretical Rome are forgotten in the stronger feeling of domestic discord and separation."

Your Lordship observes, p. 32, "The Pope's Supremacy, (an obstacle in itself, it is to be feared, fatal to Mr. Wix's project of Union,) he has not once noticed in his Reflections."

Although this has not been noticed in the "Reflections" themselves, yet in my Address to the Roman Catholics, prefixed to the 2d Edition of those Reflections, of which I sent your Lordship a copy, and your Lordship has freely animadverted on different parts of the Address, is the following passage, p. 24.

"Should the Council ever be called, the power which the Pope ought to maintain in the Christian Church, in primacy of order, might be discussed. The Church of England does not deny the authority of the

Pope; she reckons him among the senior Bishops in the Church of Christ, though she deprecates the exercise of any jurisdiction of HIS HOLINESS within these realms. This is an important subject, which would properly come before the Council, and which might be managed to the satisfaction of both the Romish Church and the Church of England." And, in the Appendix to the 2d Edition, after stating that, through a Council, the principles of primitive Christianity might be proposed as the means of concord between the Church of England and the Church of Rome, I observed, "To this, the papal Supremacy is the great, perhaps, the only obstacle; but that may not be much longer in the way. If, indeed, the Council proposed were called, the honour of the Pope, as a Christian Bishop, might be properly defined, and his authority duly circumscribed."

At page 34, your Lordship writes, "As the distribution of the Bible is certainly not an act of heresy or schism, a Clergyman cannot be charged with either, for giving it away in concurrence with heretics or schismatics."

Certainly a man cannot be charged with an act of heresy or schism for giving away a Bible with heretics or schismatics; but he is justly chargeable with giving countenance to a society made up of churchmen, and of heretics and schismatics, by being a member or a director of that society; and then a question arises, whether such countenance, though neither heretical nor schismatical in itself, does not promote the spread of heresy and schism. If, for instance, a Bishop be seen co-operating even in this work, unquestionably good in itself, (when considered apart from the association) with Socinians, Quakers, and Dissenters of the various

denominations, does he not risk, however unintentionally, the bringing about an idea that there is less of horror in his mind than there should be, for the unhappy opinions prevailing among his associates? Hence a general indifference, or a decline of affection, may be superinduced, as to those prominent vital doctrines of Christianity, which the Churchman, and the Bishop, especially, should be most zealous to maintain. The case put by your Lordship, p. 34, of refusing to give aid to infirmaries or other charities, because unbelievers may be our associates, is not similar; nor that of withdrawing our arm from a drowning fellow creature, because a "*heretic*," is giving him the same assistance. To forego co-operation in these cases, would be to violate the principle of the parable of the good Samaritan, and *to co-operate* in them can risk no injury to sound principles. On this subject I refer to the remarks copied from my Reflections, in the conclusion of the Preface to this Letter: and I beg to repeat, as I observed at p. 88, of my Reflections:

"How can Priests and Bishops, who, at their ordination, have solemnly declared, *that they will be ready with all faithful diligence, to banish and drive away all erroneous and strange doctrines contrary to God's word**; or how can any consistent lay member of the Established Church, who prays 'Almighty and everlasting God, who hast given unto us thy servants grace, by the confession of a true faith to acknowledge the glory of the eternal Trinity, and in the power of the Divine Majesty to worship the Unity: we beseech thee

* See the forms of *The Ordering of Priests and of the Consecration of Bishops*.

that thou wouldest keep us *steadfast in this faith**; how can these join in religious association with Arians, Socinians, Quakers, and every description of Dissenter? As is natural, this evil communication has corrupted good opinions, and propagated unscriptural doctrines."

Your Lordship, at p. 35, writes: "This is the third untruth in the short passage which Mr. Wix has retailed from Mr. Phelan's Pamphlet†." Mr. Phelan is well able to defend himself. In the passage referred to, he has not, as I conceive, uttered an untruth. In one capacity, the Churchmen of the society do pray for the conversion of Jews, Turks, Infidels, and Heretics; and, in another capacity, they *declare*, with much boasting, that persons by joining the society may become fraternal members of A SOCIETY OF CHRIST‡, for a pecuniary consideration, without requiring the possession of any of those qualifications which the Church deems essential to the character of Christians. As Churchmen, they pray, on Good Friday, for the conversion of Jews, Turks, Infidels, and Heretics, that they may become one fold, under one shepherd, Jesus Christ; and, in another capacity, as members of the Bible Society, which its accredited agents call "a Society of Christ," they admit members to it without requiring conversion, or any test whatever of their Christian principles.

At p. 40, is the following passage: "Mr. Wix imputes to the Church of England a deplorable indifference, pervading, as he conceives, its whole establish-

* Collect for Trinity Sunday.

† Phelan on the Bible Society.

‡ See the Christian Observer for January, 1818.

ment. He says, 'we have in this country the unhappy anomaly of an episcopal establishment and a *sectarian population*. The great body of the people are indifferent to the maintenance of the Church,' (p. 83). I am persuaded that this is a most unmerited reproach on the *great body of the people*, and on the *ministry of the Church*. For, if indifference to the maintenance of the Church be so universal, as Mr. Wix states it, it would appear *imputable to the supineness or inability of the Clergy*. But this universal indifference is a spectre of Mr. Wix's imagination. The alleged indifference, so far as it extends, is an evil, which lies, at present, in great measure, beyond the reach of the Clergy, and must be removed, as much as in us lies, by more rational and consistent means than a coalition with the Church of Rome*."

The passage in my "Reflections," (p. 83) which gave occasion to the above remarks, is—

"In the forgetfulness of all that is essential in constitution and discipline to the visible Church of Christ, we have, in this country, the unhappy anomaly of an episcopal establishment and a *sectarian population*. The great body of the people are altogether indifferent to the maintenance of the Church. Even among those who profess themselves members of it, how very little attachment do we see to it! Do not many, who would be angry at being called Dissenters, give their influ-

* Here the Bishop again loses sight of Mr. Wix's object which, he repeats, was to invite Consideration as to the Expediency of a Council to ascertain whether any thing could be done to prevail with the Roman Catholics to abandon their delusions, as the means of a Christian Union. The Bishop misconstrues this object into that of *irrationally and inconsistently desiring a coalition with the Church of Rome*. Is this fair?

ence, in matters of religion, to Dissenters? Do not Clergymen and Prelates of the Establishment, enrolling themselves in the British and Foreign Bible Society, unite in the plausible business of giving away Bibles, with persons not only hostile to the discipline of the Church, but open deniers of the atonement wrought by Jesus Christ, and public despisers of his holy sacraments? Do not our reverend and right reverend Clergy give, in this unhappy association, the great influence of that association to Socinians, to Quakers, and to any and every impugner of the Christian doctrines and sacraments? And how can this be done in any honest consistency with that zeal wherewith Christians are apostolically exhorted to *stand fast in one spirit, with one mind striving together for the faith of the Gospel**, to *hold fast the form of sound words†*, and *earnestly to contend for the faith, which was once delivered unto the saints‡*."

Now this passage conveys no *unmerited* reproach on the *ministry of the Church*, nor indeed any reproach farther than applies to those Bishops and Clergy who give influence to the schismatical spirit encouraged by an association with the Bible Society. Far, very far, indeed, it was from my intention to impute to the supineness or inability of the Clergy of the Church of England the prevailing schism, though I very sincerely lament that that portion, to whom I have alluded in the passage, should, from the purest intentions doubtless, encourage it by their association with religionists of every and of no denomination of Christians.

To your Lordship's question, "Is the contribution

* Philippians i. 27. † 2 Tim. ii. 13.

‡ Jude 3.

of nearly one hundred thousand pounds per annum for the distribution of the Scriptures, a proof of *indifference?*" (p. 42.) I reply, *certainly it is not.* But there is a zeal not according to knowledge or discretion. And I will beg permission respectfully to put a question to your Lordship. Is this great contribution effected by means favourable to the authority of the Church, and productive of that unity of faith, the establishment of which appears to have been one great object of Christ's appearing in the world? Your Lordship is, however, of opinion that the indiscriminate association encouraged by the Bible Society is "an anodyne, which may produce the most salutary effects in allaying, for a time, virulent prejudices." (p. 36.) With grief, I too well know it to be an anodyne, that has, most unhappily, allayed attachment to the true faith, and palsied some of the most honourable feelings of a Christian.

In my "Reflections," I lamented, as an instance of the prevailing schism, that many of the children who had been educated in our National Schools, cease to consider themselves members of the Established Church, and that the Church should so "fail to find that support which might be expected from the humbler classes in grateful return for the benefits of gratuitous education." (p. 83.)

"This failure," your Lordship observes, "is not imputable to the influence of the Bible Society nor to the ingratitude of the Dissenting children, but to the want of an authorized formulary of Church principles, which should instruct them in the origin and characteristics of the Christian Church, supplementary to the Church Catechism and forming an indispensable part of national education," &c. (p. 43.)

Oh ! how earnestly I wish that this suggestion of your Lordship could be carried into effect ! Such an authorized formulary is, indeed, much needed ; and might, if disapprobation of schism were duly expressed by all who should be desirous of Christian Union, prevail far, under the blessing of Almighty God, to fix correct principles in the minds of the youth educated, not only in our national, but in all our great public, or private, seminaries. It is, however, to be feared that the full benefit which your Lordship states from the measure would not be effected ; for schism, we know, prevailed even in the Apostles' days : still the attempt should be made.

“ Est quôdam prôdire tenus, si non datur ultra *.”

Most deserving of attention are your Lordship's words, on this occasion. God grant that they may be most seriously perused, and most zealously attended to, by those whose authority is equal to their ability in accomplishing so desirable a measure !

In the conclusion of your Lordship's Letter, p. 47, you observe, “ What the excellent Bishop Taylor said in *defence* of Toleration, on the question, ‘ How far the Church of Rome is *tolerable* †,’ Mr. Wix has misconstrued into an extenuation of the errors of Popery. He therefore conceives that he has the concurrence of Bishop Taylor with him in condemning the ‘ *intemperate zeal*’ of those, who ‘ have as uncharitably as absurdly stated the Church of Rome to be the *antichristian* power.’ *Intemperance, want of charity, and absurdity*, it seems, are temperate, inoffensive,

* Hor. Ep. 1. line 32.

† Liberty of Prophesying, sect. 20.

terms, in Mr. Wix's mouth, when applied to the *opponents of Popery!*"

I most respectfully, but most positively, deny having misconstrued what Bishop Taylor said in the passage quoted by me at p. 31 of my "*Reflections*," referred to by your Lordship "into an extenuation of *the errors of Popery*." I merely observed, as I now repeat, that "feeling with this great, this good, this pious, Protestant Bishop," that the Roman Catholics *keep the foundation; that they build upon God in Jesus Christ; that they profess the Apostles' Creed; that they retain faith and repentance, as the supporters of all our hopes in heaven, &c.* "I cannot agree with those who, in an intemperate zeal have, as uncharitably as absurdly, stated the Church of Rome to be the antichristian power." Here is no misconstruing the Bishop's words into an *extenuation of Popery*. The *intemperance*, the *want of charity*, and *absurdity*, were not, as your Lordship states, "temperate, inoffensive, terms, in Mr. Wix's mouth, when applied to the *opponents of Popery*;" but they were terms, I apprehend, of Christian import when applied to those who have incautiously and uncharitably denominated the Roman Church to be the great *antichristian power*, and *the denier of the Father and the Son**.—Although the words of Bishop Taylor quoted by me were assuredly used in defence of Toleration, they were still founded on the admission that the Roman Catholics do "keep the foundation of Christian faith," &c. and, therefore, their Church, by which they are taught

* Vide p. 18, of the Bishop's Letter to Lord Kenyon. "The Church of Rome," his Lordship writes, "by her idolatrous denial of the Father and the Son, is an antichristian power."

the foundation of faith, &c. cannot be, I am of opinion, consistently with that admission, **THE ANTICHRISTIAN POWER.** It will be seen, presently, that the same excellent Bishop freely declared, that there was nothing in the soul of the Roman Catholic *idololatrical*.

In a note to the conclusion of the Letter to Lord Kenyon, your Lordship observes—

“ Mr. Wix states the nature of this great schism very incorrectly. He makes it not an act of the Pope, but of the Church of England. And to distinguish it from the schism of our Dissenters, he says it is not a separation from the Church, but *a separation from error*. But this does not mark the difference between us and our Dissenters; for they, no doubt, make the same plea. The *schism* of the sixteenth century, in this country, was an act of the Pope; *it commenced with the Pope's insolent summons of Henry VIII. to Rome*; and, as Mr. Butler observes, *was consummated by the Pope's Bull*. The difference between us and our Dissenters consists in this, that we left no *Mother Church*, but adhered to the Church of England, and restored *the ancient faith and government of the Church*.”

I have the pain again to deny your Lordship's charge. I have not made the great schism *an act of the Church of England*. The passage, in my Reflections, which, I apprehend, is alluded to, is as follows:

“ It is grievous to any one, actuated by the pure principles of Christian charity, or the sincere love of religious union, to consider that so very ancient a branch of the true visible Church of Christ, as the Church of Rome indeed is, should be in disunion with the Apostolical Church of England. Incalculable are the benefits which might be derived to the Christian

cause, from all unnecessary jealousies being abandoned, and from the establishment of concord between these two great branches of the Christian Church. Every sectarian now *affects* to justify his schism from the *asserted* conduct of the Church of England, not considering that the Church of England's separation is a separation *from error*, and not a separation from *the Church*," (p. 30.).

Indeed, my Lord, it was not a separation from the Church; not from the Church of Christ—of which the Church of Rome was a real, though a corrupted, branch—but a separation from *error* and from *corruption*, that had crept into the Church. Your Lordship may designate the great schism as an act of the Pope; but do not misrepresent *me* as making it *an act of the Church of England*.

I fully agree in the concluding part of your Lordship's note, that the Dissenters are in a state of schism, having left their Mother Church. "The difference between us and the Dissenters consists in this, that we left *no Mother Church*."

The last passage which I shall notice in your Lordship's Letter to Lord Kenyon, is that in which, at p. 22, you charge me with having expressed myself in terms of too little reprobation of Romish corruptions; that I see "errors and improprieties," where the Church of England finds "repugnancy to Scripture, superstition, arrogancy, impiety, blasphemous fables, and dangerous deceits."

I hesitate not to confess, that I wish I had adopted terms more expressive of my reprobation of Romish delusions; but it should be recollected that my object was conciliatory, and I naturally adopted conciliating language. Had your Lordship done me the favour to

point out the deficiency of my terms, instead of writing me an angry note, charging me with a disposition generally to popery, I might, in the second Edition, have adopted terms of disapprobation more appropriate to the subject. I will yield to no sound Protestant in just abhorrence of doctrines that are *really, properly, and exclusively, popish*. A kind friend felt the same objection to my language, on this occasion; as your Lordship; and I am greatly obliged to him for the very friendly way in which he did me the honour to communicate his disapproval. Should I proceed to a third Edition of my "Reflections," I will correct this deficiency.

I have thus taken the liberty to state the instances in which I consider myself to have been especially misrepresented by your Lordship. I have been charged with projecting an Union with *the unreformed Church of Rome*; with incorrectly representing the sentiments of Archbishop Wake and Bishop Taylor; with continuing to propagate, to this day, the Misconceptions and Misrepresentations of Archbishop Wake, by MOSHEIM and THE AUTHOR OF THE CONFSSIONAL; with *misconceiving or mis-stating* the doctrines of my own Church; with considering the faith of the Church of Rome and of the Church of England to be *essentially the same*; with regarding the advocates of the Church of England against popery as *injurious calumniators*; with thinking the doctrine of TRANSUBSTANTIATION *in some measure warranted by the language of Scripture and our Church Catechism*; with *palliating the use of the Latin language in the Service of the ROMAN CHURCH*; with being scared by "THE SPECTRE OF DOMESTIC SCHISM," into a forgetfulness of the enormities of schismatical and heretical Rome; and, moreover, with proposing Union with the Church of

Rome to "*make head*," as your Lordship writes, against "*our Protestant dissenting brethren*," and "*the Bible Society* *." These are very serious charges, preferred by a Bishop of the Church of England against a Clergyman of the same Church. With what propriety they have been preferred, the reader may now judge.

If I may seem to have expressed myself with unbecoming warmth against what I conceive to be unkind misrepresentation, I beg to assure your Lordship and every one who thinks so that I still entertain for your Lordship sentiments of affectionate respect. Let it be considered that I have naturally felt anxious to repel charges, which, if they were well founded, would fix upon me inconsistencies unworthy of my professional character, and injurious to the cause which is equally dear to myself as it can be to my accuser.

Your Lordship, in your aversion to my proposal for consideration whether a Council should be called, offers, as an argument against it, that the Roman Catholic Reviewer of my Tract, says, "We can make no concessions that would alter the minutest article of our Creed †."—"Here," says your Lordship, "is at once, without calling a Council, a decisive refusal to every thing that a Protestant would most wish, and must indispensably require, in uniting with the Church of Rome ‡." To use your Lordship's own words, as you apply them to me on another occasion, this is to

* Vide page 32 of Letter to Lord Kenyon.

† *Catholicon* for May, 1818.

‡ Letter six, to Dr. Phillimore, sent to Mr. Wix before its appearance in the *Morning Post*, on the 9th of April, 1819, by the Bishop of St. David's, as an Advertisement to his Lordship's Letter to Lord Kenyon; and since published, with other Letters, in form of a pamphlet.

assign a strange reason why so important an attempt as that of Christian Union, on renunciation of Roman error and corruption, is not to be attempted. It is not, it is argued, to be attempted; because an anonymous Reviewer has thought proper to write, "We can make no concessions that would alter the minutest article of our faith."—Your Lordship, who has solemnly vowed to be "ready, with all faithful diligence, to banish and drive away all erroneous and strange doctrine contrary to God's Word; and both privately and openly to call upon and encourage others to the same*;" and who admits the errors and corruptions of the Church of Rome, will not justify such reasoning as this.—Instead of being deterred by the assertion of an anonymous Reviewer from the charitable attempt, you and I ought to feel that, in proportion as the Romanists are in error and corruption, so should our endeavours be more and more exerted to recover them from that error and from that corruption.

The truth is, that the Roman Catholics are disposed to make much greater concessions than is generally imagined; and there is a very prevalent disposition among them to abandon error. The unhappy association of Churchmen with the various Dissenters in the British and Foreign Bible Society, has, indeed, conveyed to the minds of many Roman Catholics, that there is a general indifference among Protestants as to any particular confession of faith. This has tended much to retard the abandonment of Roman errors. And when the Roman Catholics have observed Bishops and Clergymen of the Church of England giving coun-

* The form of ordaining or consecrating of an ARCHBISHOP or BISHOP.

tenance to a Society composed of persons of the various denominations of Christians, and of no denomination, deriving a portion of their funds from the preaching of a schismatical ministry, they have been justly alarmed, not only for the discipline, but also for the faith, of the Christian Church. They have, therefore, carried their repugnance to concession further than their own good sense would otherwise have allowed them to do; and are very likely to have been checked in the abandonment of their errors and corruptions by those who have most loudly and most zealously declaimed against their delusions.

I have, therefore, felt it to be my duty to invite consideration as to the Expediency of a Council being called, consisting of persons of authority, ability, meekness, and piety, to consider whether any thing can be done towards prevailing with the Romanists to recant their errors, and to reform from their corruptions; and *then* to unite with the Church of England, apostolical in her discipline, and pure in her faith. Let none be led to suppose from the excessive zeal manifested by your Lordship against the Roman Catholics, that a Council of the nature proposed, must have in view an Union with the Church of Rome in her *unreformed state*. Such an object is most positively disclaimed: and such it must be evident to any dispassionate person, who has done me the favour to read the extracts from my “Reflections,” given in the former part of this Letter, could not have been within my view.

Had it been before me to have stated the obstacles to Union, I would have stated as an insurmountable obstacle, so long as it continues, the asserted supremacy of the Pope. The authority of the Pope, as a

legitimate and very ancient Bishop in the Christian Church, has been, and is, acknowledged; but I deprecated, in my Address to the Roman Catholics, prefixed to my Reflections, and I continue to deprecate, the exercise of any jurisdiction of the Bishop of Rome within these realms. Under this impression, I have omitted no opportunity of uttering my decided disapprobation of measures that tended to give effect to Papal supremacy on British land. The doctrine of the Invocation of Saints is, also, an obstacle that must be fatal to Union, so long as it prevails. There are, also, many other obstacles of a no less serious nature; but which it was not necessary, nor within the object of my "Reflections" to anticipate; my object having been to invite consideration as to the Expediency of a Council being called to consider what the obstacles were, and whether measures might be adopted to remove them.—To have discussed them before-hand could have become no individual; and could only have risked an irritation unfavourable to the object of the proposal.

You have, my Lord, in one of your Letters in the Morning Post, since published with other Letters in a pamphlet*, and also in your Letter to Lord Kenyon, (p. 11,) stated, that I *once* thought the custom of invoking the saints idolatrous. I certainly did so. I had been used to hear it so called; and I, too, adopted an idea very generally prevailing. I have since read much, and thought much, on the subject; and the result is, that, though I think it most objectionable, it does not, *as it is taught by the Roman Church*, amount to idolatry; though I fear it has amounted to

* Letter IX. to Dr. Phillimore.

idolatry, as it has been practised by some of the members of that Church. I hesitate not to make this confession, deeming it more candid to acknowledge what I conceive my mistake, than to attempt to palliate it by ingenious excuses ; and I hope I shall never be disinclined to acknowledge any error into which I may have fallen, when it is kindly pointed out to me.

But, in the same Letter, in which your Lordship reminds your Readers that I *once* thought this doctrine idolatrous, you also intimate that I think differently from what I *once* did on many other subjects which you have there noticed. I am very much grieved that your Lordship should have so unkindly misrepresented me ; and, once for all, I declare that, on those subjects my opinion remains as it was when I published my Scriptural Illustrations of the 39 Articles, in the year 1808. I love, with an unfeigned love, that branch of the Church of Christ established in these dominions ; and I thank God that I have been blessed with a knowledge of the sacred truths professed by her. As to the Church of Rome, to use the language of Bishop Hall, “ She is a truly *visible Church*, but an unsound, in what she holds the principles we embrace her ; in what destroys them, we pity her error, and hate her obstinacy*.”

The only difference between my present opinions, and my opinions heretofore published, respecting the Invocation of Saints, is, as to the propriety of calling that Invocation, as it is directed by the Church of Rome, absolutely idolatrous. Respecting the practices of mistaken individuals, I fear that no ex-

* Bishop Hall's “ No Peace with Rome,” as terms now stand. Section 1.

pression of your Lordship, as to their idolatry, would be short of what might really be charged upon them; but they are mistaken individuals, they are devout disciples of *their* and *our* Redeemer: and, while we lament that, under a dangerous suggestion of their Church, that *it is good and useful to invoke saints*, they have fallen into idolatry, they merit our pity equally as our censure. “Willing or unwilling, they are still our brethren; and then only can they cease to be such, when they cease to adore the same Deity as ourselves, and call Him the general Father of Mankind.” —*Aug.* in Psal. 32 *. Let us therefore fervently pray, and earnestly endeavour, that we may be successful in turning them from their error by the mildness of persuasion.

In conclusion, I beg to observe, that, if it shall be thought that I have conveyed in my writings too slight a disapprobation of the Romish practice of invoking saints, which has been called idolatrous, by not so calling it myself; far from desiring to defend the practice, I have represented it among those errors in which the Roman Catholics are expected to make concessions before there can be Union between the two Churches. Should it, after what has been observed, be asked, why I have refused to call it idolatrous, I would reply that I have principally been restrained from so calling it with a view to truth; and, moreover, to preserve the Roman Catholics from that irritation which must be unfavourable to their abandonment of error and corruption, which abandonment I have as warmly at

* Doleamus illos fratres, tanquam fratres nostros. Velint; nolint, fratres nostri sunt. Tunc esse desinent fratres nostri, si desierint dicere pater noster.

heart, as the most zealous declaimer against popery ought to have. But, denying not, as Bishop Bull, of our Church, in his Answer to Bishop Meaux, denied not, *that the saints departed do offer up their prayers to God for us**, there is something, according to my feeling, so inconsistent with the mild spirit of the Gospel, to call millions of our fellow creatures idolaters, for piously invoking those saints; fellow creatures, and fellow Christians, who disclaim the opprobrium of idolatry, and shudder at it equally with ourselves, that I am most anxious to guard against so uncharitable, so unnecessary an accusation†. The custom is, indeed, without warranty of Scripture, and it tends to idolatry, as has been already admitted. This should stimulate the best endeavours of the pious and the judicious, by

* “As to what follows, *that the saints departed do offer up their prayers to God for us*; if it be understood of the Intercession of the saints in general, we deny it not. But this is no reason why we should pray to them to pray for us. Nay, on the contrary, if the deceased saints do, of their own accord, and out of their perfect charity, pray for us, what need we be so solicitous to call upon them for their prayers, especially, when our reason and Scripture also tell us, that we are out of their hearing, and that they do not, cannot, know our particular wants and necessities?”—*The Corruptions of the Church of Rome*, p. 43.

† Denique multis jam sæculis in universâ Ecclesiâ, in oriente non minus quam in occidente etiam in Aquilone apud Muscovitas, Litanía est decantata, ut puta, S. Petre, ora pro nobis. Totius autem ecclesiæ universalem consensum spernere aut dâmnare res est longe periculosissima.—*Considerationes modestæ et pacificæ*, per Gulielmum Forbesium, S. T. D. et Episcopum Edinburgensem primum. *De Invocatione Angelorum. Pars altera. Cap. 4.*

“I grant it no idolatry, that is, not necessarily any idolatry, to pray to saints to pray for us.”—*Thorndike’s Epilogue to the Tragedy*, p. 360.

all holy and discreet means, to prevail with our mistaken brethren to forsake a custom that is unscriptural, and a superstition that is indefensible. The way to do so, is not to load it with a turpitude which does not properly belong to it; but it is by meekness, by temperance, by Christian charity, to persuade our mistaken brother. The great apostle, St. Paul, impressed with the solemn truth that we must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ, that every one may receive the things done in his body, according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad, observes, "Knowing therefore the terror of the Lord, we persuade men*." We may hence, with humility, infer how the holy apostle would have adopted the mild arts of persuasion, if he had had to convince those who really thought that they were discharging their duty by invoking saints and angels as mediators, not of *redemption*, but of *intercession*, and *that* through the alone merits of Jesus Christ. Would the apostle have called this "*antichristian, heretical, and idolatrous?*"

I have not, in this present publication, nor in my "Reflections," expressed any opinion of my own as to the imputed idolatry of Transubstantiation, and its consequences; of Reverence of Images; and of some other doctrines and usages of the Roman Church, which have been considered to be idolatrous. I gladly, indeed, availed myself of an extract from General Thornton's Speech, delivered on the 7th of May, 1818, on his motion to repeal the declaration, asserting the

* 2 Cor. v. 11.

Church of Rome to be idolatrous ; because I was glad to find a respectable layman charitably submitting for consideration the propriety of softening an offensive charge, which has, I fear, tended to confirm the Romanist in his delusions, while it has irritated him beyond a temper open to conviction. I deprecate the undue reverence which is paid by the Roman Catholics to the sacrament, as a custom “ leading to the reverence and worship of the creature, instead of the Creator * ;” and, whenever it does lead to that reverence and worship which is due only to the Creator, there idolatry is practised. I consider, therefore, the whole doctrine of Transubstantiation a fundamental and a very dangerous error. Yet the Roman Catholic worships, in his heart, no creature ; and he pays divine adoration only, as he conceives, to God. Bishop Jeremy Taylor, with his usual sagacity, and his usual charity, viewed this doctrine in a very different light from many who have regarded it as absolute idolatry. His words are, and they well deserve the most serious consideration of every Protestant—

“ If the doctrine of Transubstantiation be false, (as upon much evidence we believe it is) then it is accused of introducing idolatry, giving divine worship to a creature, adoring of bread and wine ; and then comes in the precept of God to the Jews, that those prophets who persuaded to idolatry should be slain.

“ But here we must deliberate, for it is concerning the lives of men ; and yet a little deliberation may suffice ; for idolatry is a forsaking the true God, and

* *Scriptural Illustration* of the 28th Article. By Samuel Wix, A.M.

giving divine worship to a creature, or to an idol, that is, to an imaginary God, who hath no foundation in essence or existence. And is that kind of superstition which by divines is called the superstition of an undue object. Now it is evident that the object of their adoration (that which is represented to them in their minds, their thoughts, and purposes; and by which God principally, if not solely, takes estimate of human actions) in the blessed sacrament, is the only true and eternal God, hypostatically joined with the holy humanity, which humanity they believe actually present under the veil of the sacramental signs. And, if they thought Him not present, they are so far from worshipping the bread in this case, that themselves profess it to be idolatry to do so, which is a demonstration that their soul hath nothing in it that is idololatrical. If their confidence and fanciful opinion hath engaged them upon so great mistake (as without doubt it hath), yet the will hath nothing in it, but what is a great enemy to idolatry.

“But,” continues this learned and pious writer, “for the article itself, we all say that Christ is there present some way or other extraordinary; and it will not be amiss to worship him at that time, when he gives himself to us in so mysterious a manner, and with so great advantages; especially since the whole office is a consecration of diverse actions of religion, and divine worship. Now, in all opinions of those men who think it an act of religion to communicate and to offer; a divine worship is given to Christ, and is transmitted to him by mediation of that action and that sacrament; and it is no more in the Church of Rome, but that they differ and mistake infinitely in the manner of his presence;

which error is wholly seated in the understanding; and does not communicate with the will; for all agree that the divinity and the humanity of the Son of God is the ultimate and adequate object of divine adoration, and that it is incommunicable to any creature whatsoever; and, before they venture to pass an act of adoration, they believe the bread to be annihilated, or turned into his substance, who may lawfully be worshipped; and they who have these thoughts, are as much enemies of idolatry, as they that understand better how to avoid that inconvenience which is supposed to be the crime, which they formally hate, and we materially avoid."—*Liberty of Prophecy*, Sect. 20. Numb. 16 and 17. P. 348.

Your Lordship will now perceive that, if I had extended my remarks to the doctrine of Transubstantiation, and had pronounced that that doctrine was not necessarily and absolutely idolatrous, I should not have been without respectable and powerful authority; but I have merely stated my opinion that the Invocation of Saints, that is, Invocation, as it is directed and guarded by the Church of Rome, is not idolatrous; for which I am charged with having misconceived or mis-stated the doctrines of my own Church. I hope, however, I have observed enough to clear me from such an imputation, and to protect me from the suspicion of having changed any of the opinions which I once entertained as properly the opinions of the Church of England, of which, by God's blessing, I trust ever to continue, however unworthy, yet a sound, member.

Permit me, my Lord, to express my fears, that, unless something on the conciliatory principle which

I have suggested be accomplished (I mean not the surrender of any one scriptural truth, nor the admission of any one Roman Catholic doctrine *that is false*) the schisms now unhappily prevailing, will continue to prevail. A desire to preserve the Roman Catholics in a temper open to a conviction of their errors and delusions, has admonished me not to charge them with consequences which they themselves disown. This can only irritate them, and tend to confirm them in their errors.—I would, therefore, state my feelings respecting what I have written upon this occasion, in the words of the good Archbishop Tenison.

“ Concerning the *temper* observed in this writing, I have endeavoured to abstain from all unnecessary heat and severe language. For I cannot persuade myself that the witchcraft of error can be removed, or so much as weakened by the mere scratches of the pen. It hath also been my care not to misrepresent the opinions of those from whom I differ, yet I am sensible that this very impartiality, with which I move in the middle path, will draw upon me the censorious lashes of many zealots who place themselves on either hand.—Those whom *Jesuitick bigotry* possesseth, will say I have maliciously blackened their Church. Others, whose over-rigid humour must needs pass for the only Protestantism, whose religion sheweth itself in nothing but a fierce and indiscreet zeal against *Popery*, will think my pen hath flattered. They will cry out that it hath imitated his pencil, who drew the loose *Gabrielle* in the figure of chaste *Diana*.

“ But I have, I hope, avoided both those extremes. Most certain I am, I have studied to do so. And

if just moderation must be blamed, I am willing to be a sufferer in so good, so honourable a cause*.”

Permit me, my Lord, to continue in the spirit of this truly Christian Archbishop, to quote the words of another writer, himself a convert from the errors and corruptions of the Roman Church.

“The tenets,” he writes, “of the Established Church, as well as the morals of those that adhere to it, have often been attacked by the most unequitable means: so also have those of the Roman Catholics. It is still believed by many of the lower class, and sometimes propagated with as little truth as justice, that their priests pretend to pardon sin, without requiring a firm purpose of amendment, and a real sorrow for past offences—that they can grant an indult for treason, perjury, prevarication, injustice, or deceit; and absolve from even *future* crimes—that they hold it lawful, or, at least, dispensable, to break their faith with heretics—that they still believe the Pope to be infallible and impeccable—that, without any restriction or exception, they refuse the possibility of salvation to all who dissent from their religious tenets, &c. And a thousand other extravagant opinions have been affixed to them as articles of their belief, through malevolence or misconception. But it should be considered, that the countenancing such idle reports as these, is not only most unchristian and unjustifiable in itself; but is even of infinite detriment to our own cause. For it affords an opportunity to an able adversary to raise a pre-

* Epistle Dedicatory to Archbishop Tenison's Discourse of Idolatry.

judice against ourselves, by exposing the calumny and falsehood of the imputation." *Address to the Reader; by the Rev. John Hawkins, prefixed to his Letter to William Pelling.*

I will now only add, that I hope no more to be obliged to appear in controversy. I have entered upon it with great reluctance, and with many painful feelings. Indeed, I very much dislike all controversy; but especially religious controversy. *That* can, I fear, be seldom carried on in a temper becoming Christians. Unhappily, I have been misconceived and misrepresented, when I was anxiously attempting to prepare the way for truth and for concord among Christians. I have therefore, been obliged to defend myself, in doing which I have endeavoured to retain all that respect which is due to a superior, though I must think, and I think so with the deepest regret, that your Lordship's Misrepresentations of my object, and referring me to the *Eclectic Review*, presuming that you knew all that that Review has so coarsely insinuated against me, was very incautious and very unkind. Opposite parties too often make a merit of blackening their adversaries; I trust, however, that your Lordship and I shall not be adversaries; and I hope I have not exceeded the lawful boundaries of Christian indignation, however I have been misconceived, or however things have been laid to my charge which I know not.

If I have, indeed, been *mistaken*, and I feel that I am subject to mistake to an extent that humbles me in my own eyes; may God magnify his power in my weakness! May it please him to bring into the way of truth, all such as have erred, and are deceived!

And may He grant to the Church of his Son, our alone Mediator and Redeemer, Jesus Christ, that purity, that truth, that unity of sentiment, which are of the essence of the Gospel!

I am, my Lord, with every due sentiment of respect, and with best wishes,

Your Lordship's affectionate

and faithful Servant,

SAMUEL WIX.

THE END.

